"O Biblios" – The Book - Overview

(John Chrysostom AD 345-407)
Testimony to ***"the scripture of Truth"*** Daniel 10:21

Alan James O'Reilly

Contents

1

What is the Bible?

"O Biblios" - The Book, John Chrysostom, AD 345-407[1 p 48]

N.B. This work is drawn from the author's book *"O Biblios"* Chapters 1-7. A table has been added.

1.1 Introduction

That question demands a right answer. The need for the right answer has never been more pressing than it is today. A famous preacher once said to his congregation – speaking of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible:

"The Bible is God's word, and when I see it, I seem to hear a voice saying, 'I am the Book of God, man, read me; I am God's writing: open my leaves, for I was penned by God'...I plead with you, I beg of you, respect your Bibles, and search them out. Go home and read your Bibles...O Book of books! And wast thou written by my God? Then I will bow before thee, thou Book of vast authority! For He has written this Book Himself...let us love it, let us count it more precious than fine gold!" Charles Haddon Spurgeon[1 p 23]

In spite of this exhortation, many Christians now believe that the popular, modern bible translations are superior to the Authorized Holy Bible, known simply as the Authorized Version or 'King James' Version, because they are based on a superior Greek text. This belief no doubt stems in large part from the views expressed in the Prefaces of the modern translations, where sweeping allusions to *"the best Greek text"* or *"the best available Greek text"* or *"the earliest and best manuscripts"* may be found. In fact, the Greek text upon which most of the modern New Testaments are based is actually a corrupt text devised by the Gnostic philosophers of Alexandria, Egypt, chief of whom was Origen (184-254 AD). Less than 10 percent of extant Greek manuscripts of the New Testament conforms to this corrupt text. Historically, the true text emanates from Antioch of Syria (Acts 11:26, 13:1, 2) and has been preserved not only in the vast majority of Greek manuscripts but also in various faithful early translations, such as the Old Latin, Old (Peshitta) Syriac and Gothic. These translations, together with the Syrian manuscripts, constitute the Bibles of the true believers during the Dark Ages and on into the Reformation. Other valuable witnesses to the Syrian text as the true text type are early Christian writers, known as church 'fathers.' Even the Alexandrian manuscripts contain much of the Antiochan text.

This text eventually emerges in the 16th century as an edited Greek New Testament, later called the *"Received Text"* or *"Textus Receptus."* Following numerous editions involving only minor modifications, the Textus Receptus re-appears in pure form in the 17th century as the Authorized Version of 1611, AV1611; in English, the language of the end times. Subsequent editions of the AV1611 differ from the 1611 Edition mainly* in matters of spelling, punctuation and Italics, where obviously variation is possible without discrepancy. Allowing for correction of typographical errors by later editions, the actual TEXT of any AV1611 available today is the same as that of 1611. *Minor word changes exist between the early AV1611 editions and the standard text published by Dr Blayney in 1769. See Chapter 5. These changes are listed in *A Textual History of the King James Bible* by David Norton, Cambridge University Press, ISBN 0-521-77100-5.

The significance of the Received Greek Text should not, of course, be overestimated. It served mainly as an important *anti-Catholic* witness to the true text of scripture found in the vernacular Bibles of the time. See *In Awe of Thy Word* Parts 6, 7 by Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger. However, it has served that purpose satisfactorily over the centuries.

Throughout history, the Syrian text type, especially in its pure form as the AV1611, is invariably associated with great movements of the Spirit of God in revival, missionary outreach, social and material progress and with the lives and ministries of great men and women of God. The Alexandrian text type, by contrast, forms the basis for the 'bibles' of the Roman Catholic 'Church' via the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. It is thus always associated with spiritual deadness, social and moral degeneration, abominable idolatries and savage persecutions against true Bible believers, even to this day, as in Ulster*, the Republic of Ireland, Latin America, Spain and the Philippines.

*Up until recently. It should always be remembered that Rome is never so dangerous as when appearing benign. See also www.chick.com/catalog/books/0153.asp *Smokescreens* by Jack T. Chick, 1983, Chapter Two, *The Hand of Rome*, pp 16-17.

Though eclipsed largely (and possibly deliberately) by reports of Mohammedan persecution of Christians, see Barnabus Fund news, barnabasfund.org/UK/News/News-analysis/, Catholic subversion continues in its efforts to set up the Devil's one-world government under the papal antichrist or the Beast of Revelation 13, www.chick.com/articles/worldgovernment.asp. See also *Codeword Barbêlôn* by P. D. Stuart, ISBN 978-0-9543596-6-9 and *Queen of All* by Jim Tetlow et al, ISBN 0-9717561-1-2.

Sadly, it is this Alexandrian text type which the Body of Christ in this last century has been deceived into accepting as *"the oldest and best."* This deception stems from the conniving of Westcott and Hort, two Cambridge theologians who masterminded the 1881 Revision Committee which produced the Revised Version, RV, progenitor of most of the modern translations. The success of the deception may be attributed mainly to the attitudes of born-again, fundamental, conservative, evangelical Christians who have shown more regard for naturalistic scholarship than for the living words of the living God.

Nevertheless, there remains a formidable body of witnesses for the AV1611, provided by the works of Burgon, Burton, Fuller, Gipp, Grady, Hills, Ray, Riplinger, Ruckman, Ward, the Trinitarian Bible Society and others. John Burgon was a true Christian scholar and contemporary of Westcott and Hort, champions of the corrupt Catholic Codex B or Vaticanus manuscript[2 pp 134-143]. Dr David Otis Fuller was a pastor and Bible teacher for over fifty years and Chairman of the *Which Bible?* Society. Drs. Samuel Gipp and William Grady are seasoned Bible-believing Baptist pastors. Dr Edward F. Hills was a graduate of Yale and Harvard Universities and another true Christian scholar[2 p 6, 3 p 11]. Jasper J. Ray, now with the Lord, was a business manager, missionary and Bible teacher. Norman Ward and Barry Burton are informed laymen whose books are invaluable primers. Dr Mrs Gail Riplinger devoted several years of full-time research in order to produce the definitive book *New Age Bible Versions* showing the occult roots of the modern bibles. Dr Peter S. Ruckman is President of the Pensacola Bible Institute and probably the most forthright advocate of the AV1611 in the world today. The TBS is the only Bible society loyal to the AV1611 in this country.

Bro. Ray had actually passed away in 1985, before *"O Biblios"* was published, www.baptistboard.com/archive/index.php/t-26782.html. His work has been progressed by Dr Paul Heaton in his book *Could the NIV be the True Word of God*, The Kings Publishing Company, 1995. See also bbc.m33access.com/pastor.htm. Dr Heaton is pastor of the Bible Baptist Church, Lupton, Michigan.

This work has been undertaken to show that the AV1611 King James Bible is the pure word of God, given by inspiration of God, infallible and finally authoritative. A second reason for this work is to expose the modern translations for what they are - Satanic counterfeits which either omit or distort genuine scriptures or impugn them by means of equivocal footnotes or marginal notes. It may come as a surprise to some readers to discover how the text of a popular, supposedly 'evangelical' translation such as the NIV repeatedly matches that of the Roman Catholic Jesuit Douay-Rheims, Jerusalem and New Jerusalem bibles and the New World Translation of the Jehovah's Witnesses. However, this is to be expected, given that the basic Greek text of these four 'bibles' is largely that of the Alexandrian manuscripts, particularly B or Vaticanus and Aleph or Sinaiticus, which are in turn the basis for Jerome's Roman Catholic Latin Vulgate.

It is common for fundamental, evangelical Christians to defend discrepancies between the AV1611 and the modern versions. They insist that *"not one fundamental of the faith is affected."* Inspection of the evidence will reveal that such statements are at best half-truths. It is true that ANY translation (including the NWT!) contains 'the fundamentals of the faith' such as the Trinity, virgin birth, blood atonement, resurrection, ascension, Second Advent. However, it is also true that the modern versions often weaken the testimony of scripture to these fundamentals by omission or distortion of words preserved in the AV1611. However, the main issue is not 'the fundamentals.' The main issue is that of FINAL AUTHORITY in ALL MATTERS of faith and practice - not merely those which are deemed 'fundamental' by saved, conservative, evangelical apostates.

It is hoped therefore, that as he reads the following pages, the sincere Bible believer will see that FINAL AUTHORITY rests with the BOOK and not with the 'preferences' of born-again, Bible-rejecting fundamentalists.

1.2 The Sources of the Holy Bible, AV1611[2 pp 26-27, 4 pp 69-91, 5 pp 115-121]

Vindication of the AV1611 as the pure word of God rightly begins with a study of its roots. Examination of the sources of the AV1611 shows how the Lord preserved His pure word down through the centuries in order to bring it forth during the English Protestant Reformation in pure form.

Much more detailed manuscript evidence on the sources of the AV1611 and comparison of its readings with those of the modern bibles will be found in the works of Dr J. A. Moorman, published by *The Bible for Today*, 900 Park Avenue, Collingswood, N.J. 08108, USA, www.biblefortoday.org/search.asp. These works are highly recommended.

1.2.1 Sources of the AV1611 New Testament

In brief, these are as follows.

1. The Greek manuscripts, uncial or upper case, cursive or lower case, lectionary and papyrus. Collators have designated uncial manuscripts by capitals, e.g. Aleph ℵ, A, B, C, D, Delta Δ, Theta Θ, Psi Ψ, etc. A 'zero' designation is also used, e.g. 046, 047, 048 etc., which sometimes overlaps with the capitals designation, e.g. E-07, F-09, G-011 etc. Cursives, lectionaries and papyri have mainly been catalogued numerically, e.g. Cursive 28, Lectionary 547, Papyrus or P66 etc.

2. The ancient versions, e.g. Old Latin, Old Syriac, of which there are several variants, the most important being the Peshitta, or 'simple' version of the 2nd century, Coptic, Gothic etc., whose texts date from the 2nd to the 6th centuries. The Old Latin manuscripts are catalogued alphabetically, e.g. a, aur, d, f etc. or alphanumerically, e.g. ff2, r1 etc.

3. Quotations from early 'church fathers.'

This triad overwhelmingly vindicates the AV1611 Text according to Scriptural principle: Deuteronomy 19:15, Matthew 18:16, 2 Corinthians 13:1. See Watts *The Lord Gave the Word* TBS, 1998, www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/lordgaveword.asp.

A more detailed listing of the AV1611 New Testament sources follows.

1.2.2 **New Testament Greek Manuscripts**

Most of these manuscripts contain only parts of the New Testament. Burton gives the total as 5309[6 p 58]. Watts gives the following totals for 1989.

Type of Manuscript	**Century When Written**	**Number of Copies**
Uncials, upper case	4th-9th	299
Cursives, lower case	9th-16th	2812
Lectionaries, responsive readings	9th-16th	2281
Papyri, fragments	3rd	96
Total		5488

The majority of the Greek manuscripts conform to the 'Syrian' or 'Byzantine' Text type, also known as the 'Traditional Text.' This is essentially the text of the AV1611. The remainder of the manuscripts are largely of the so-called 'Alexandrian' Text type. Codex B, Vaticanus and Codex Aleph, Sinaiticus are the most famous - or infamous - of the Alexandrian manuscripts[6 pp 57ff].

1.2.3 **Major New Testament Ancient Versions**

Version	**Century When First Written**	**Approximate Number of Copies**
Old Latin	2nd-4th	50
Old Syriac	2nd (Peshitta)-4th	350
Gothic of Ulfilas, *"the Little Wolf"*	4th	6[5 p 120]

A complete Latin Bible, the Italic version, was circulating in northern Italy by 157 AD and contained the Johannine Comma[2 p 213, 4 p 77, 7 p 98]. The Johannine Comma is 1 John 5:7, 8 as it reads in an Authorized Version:

"For there are three that bear record <u>in heaven</u>, <u>the Father</u>, <u>the Word</u>, <u>and the Holy Ghost</u>: <u>and these three are one</u>. And there are three that bear witness <u>in earth</u>, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree <u>in one</u>."

The same passage in an NIV reads as follows:

"For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement."

The 19 words that have been underlined in the reading from the Authorized Version are either omitted from modern bibles, or disputed in the footnotes. The omission is a direct attack on vital Christian doctrines, including the Trinity, or Godhead and the strength of witness to the First Coming in the flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ. There was a trio of

witnesses *in heaven* and a trio *on earth* and both sets agreed amongst themselves and with each other *as one*.

Overall, the texts of the ancient versions agree with the Syrian type text* of the majority of the Greek manuscripts except where known corruptions have been introduced by Alexandrian scribes[4 p 81]. *In ratio at least 3:1 and 2:1 Syrian versus Alexandrian for the extant Peshitta and Old Latin respectively, according to Dr Moorman's analyses – see above.

1.2.4 **Quotations of Early Church 'Fathers'**

1. **Western**

Irenaeus	130-202 AD
Tertullian	150-220 AD
Cyprian	200-258 AD
Augustine	354-430 AD

With the exception of Tertullian, these men were the 'founding fathers' of the Roman Catholic Church[4 p 76].

2. **Alexandrian**

Clement	150-215 AD
Origen	182-254 AD

Both Clement and Origen were Gnostics. Although Origen professed Christian belief, he rejected the Deity and High Priesthood of Christ, the physical resurrection and the Second Advent. He believed in infant baptism, universal salvation and forgiveness of sin through communion[6 pp 64-65, 8 p 8]. He repeatedly corrupted Bible manuscripts to conform to his beliefs[4 pp 55-56, 6 pp 64-65]. Origen is also most closely associated with the LXX or 'Septuagint'[4 pp 40-54].

3. **Antiochan**

Polycarp	69-155 AD
Tatian	120-200 AD
John Chrysostom	345-407 AD

Tatian's 'Diatessaron' or 'Harmony' of the Gospels bears witness to AV1611 readings in Luke 2:33, John 5:3b-4, 9:35 and elsewhere[1 p 69, 192, 4 pp 80, 209]. John Chrysostom was known as the *"golden mouthed"* preacher.

These men and others quote the New Testament more than 35000 times[1 p 322]. Most of the New Testament can be reconstructed from their writings[9 p 30]. Despite the heretical beliefs of the Western and Alexandrian Fathers, the fathers' quotations support the Syrian text in ratio 3:2 against the Alexandrian text and in ratio 3:1 in 30 important doctrinal passages[3 pp 237-238].

1.2.5 **Old Testament Sources**[2 p 181]

The following should be noted:

1. The Old Testament was in a *"settled condition"* by the time of Christ.
2. Hebrew scriptures were preserved intact by Masoretic Scribes until the advent of printing, 1450 AD[5 p 92].
3. Many scholars insist that an allegedly BC Greek translation of the Old Testament, the LXX or Septuagint, was used by the Lord and His Apostles. The facts[4 pp 41-54] are:
4. The only evidence for a BC LXX is the spurious writing *"Letter of Aristeas."*
5. All LXX manuscripts are extant from 200 AD or later.
6. The original LXX is the 5th column of Origen's 6-column parallel Old Testament 'Hexapala' and contains the Apocrypha.
7. Brenton's LXX Edition, Zondervan, uses the texts of Codex B Vaticanus, 4th century AD and Codex A Alexandrinus, 5th century and declares the Apocrypha to be *"a portion of the Bible of Christendom."*

The LXX is highly regarded by Greek scholars. If they can convince the Body of Christ that the LXX was the Lord's 'bible', they could easily and significantly extend their influence over that Body[10 p 48]. See samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=09.htm.

The book *The Mythological Septuagint* by Dr Peter S. Ruckman, 1996, available from the Bible Baptist Bookstore, provides a detailed study of the dubious nature of the LXX.

1.3 Two Sets of Greek Manuscripts

1.3.1 **The Antiochan Manuscripts**

1. 95 % of all Greek manuscripts belong to this group[6 p 57, 11] – copies available from this author upon request.

   See also *The Great Bible Robbery* www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/.
2. They were faithfully preserved by the Bible believers of Antioch of Syria[2 p 187, 6 p 57, 9 p 31].
3. They agree closely with each other[2 p 187].
4. At least 90 % support the AV1611 Text[2 p 26].
5. They are the basis for the Received Text or Textus Receptus, the Greek Text underlying the AV1611 and other Protestant Bibles.
6. At least 80-90 % of ALL manuscripts support the AV1611 Text[2 p 26, 12 p 476].

1.3.2 **The Alexandrian Manuscripts**

1. Only 5 % of all Greek manuscripts belong to this group.
2. They are either originally Antiochan manuscripts, corrupted by Gnostics of Alexandria, especially Origen[2, pp 188-193, 6 pp 57-64, 9 pp 44-46], or corrupt copies of Antiochan manuscripts.
3. They disagree significantly from Antiochan manuscripts and even with each other[2 pp 136, 272, 5 p 222, 6 p 60].

4. 80 heretical sects existed in the 4th century[2 p 182], 2 Corinthians 2:17, aggravating the problem of manuscripts corruption.
5. They form the basis for all 'bibles' of the Roman Catholic Church[2 p 193, 9 pp 46-47].
6. They form the basis for most modern versions. Most of the differences from the AV1611 arise from these manuscripts, for all modern versions including the NKJV[1 pp 127ff, 4 pp 92ff, 6 pp 57, 65, 7 pp 17-72, 9 pp 49-51].

1.3.3 Manuscript Offshoots

They stem from both sets of manuscripts.

1. Some Antiochan type manuscripts are called 'Caesarean.' They were probably corrupted by Origen[1 p 285].
2. A few manuscripts are called 'Western.' They exhibit additions - and subtractions - probably introduced in Rome[5 pp 121-125].

1.3.4 'Older' but not 'Better'

Although Alexandrian manuscripts are OLDER than Antiochan, it will be shown later that they are not BETTER[9 pp 32-34, 13 pp 271-288]. There are several reasons why extant Alexandrian manuscripts have survived longer than their Antiochan counterparts.

1. The Egyptian climate was more conducive to manuscripts preservation than the Syrian.
2. Persecution of Antiochan Christians was more protracted and intense.
3. The Antiochan manuscripts material was papyri or parchment. These manuscripts were therefore more fragile than the Alexandrian, which consisted of best quality vellum or antelope skin.
4. The Antiochan manuscripts were more used than the Alexandrian.
5. The Antiochan manuscripts were often destroyed after recopying.
6. Some scholars allege that the Antiochan manuscripts stem from the so-called *"Lucian Recension,"* an alleged 4th century standardisation of the Antiochan text type. It is then further alleged that this standard text then supplanted the older Alexandrian type, supposedly closer to the original manuscripts. There is no historical evidence to support these allegations, which were utterly refuted by Dean Burgon[13].

1.4 Antioch vs. Alexandria in the Bible[1 pp 310-311, 14 pp 54-56, New Edition pp 76, 82]

The scriptures themselves testify to the location of the centre for manuscripts compilation and distribution which the Lord ordained.

1.4.1 Antioch, Syria

1. The church in Antioch sent out the first Bible teachers, Acts 13:1.
2. The first missionary trip went from Antioch, Acts 13:1-6.
3. The word ***"Christian"*** originated in Antioch, Acts 11:26.

1.4.2 Alexandria, Egypt

1. God called His Son out of Egypt, Matthew 2.
2. God called Jacob out of Egypt, Genesis 49.

3. God called Israel out of Egypt, Exodus 15.
4. God called Joseph's bones out of Egypt, Exodus 13.
5. God never wanted His people to return to Egypt, Deuteronomy 17:16.

Which city would GOD choose to compile a New Testament 1 Corinthians 14:33?

Which city would YOU choose? Do you suppose that GOD has as much sense as YOU Isaiah 55:8, 9?

1.5 Two Lines of Bibles[2 p 187, 4 p 71, 7 pp 15-18, 71, 87, 8 p 7, 15]

1.5.1 The Antiochan Stream

1. This stream stems from the Antiochan manuscripts.
2. This stream appears with very little change in many Protestant Bibles and culminates in the AV1611.
3. The Waldenses, or Vaudois, were Bible-believing Christians of northern Italy. Their Italic Bible dates from the 2nd century AD and essentially matches the Text of the AV1611.
4. Wycliffe appears to have used both the Old Latin and the Vulgate for his Bible, 1382. Wycliffe's Bible did NOT contain the Apocrypha[16 pp 309-311].

1.5.2 The Alexandrian Stream

1. This stream stems from the Alexandrian manuscripts, corrupted by Origen.
2. Constantine, 331 AD, ordered the historian Eusebius to produce 50 bibles from Origen's mutilated manuscripts[2 p 3]. They were the first 'Catholic' bibles.
3. Codex B Vaticanus and Codex Aleph Sinaiticus are probably of this group.
4. The Latin Vulgate of Jerome became the official 'bible' of the Roman Catholic Church for 1000 years[7 p 20, 9 p 46]. It derives largely from the Alexandrian manuscripts.
5. The NKJV, 'Jerry Falwell Version' JFV, is based on the Textus Receptus*, but contains many Alexandrian readings and is therefore a hybrid. See Chapter 7 and Table 1. Jerry Falwell, leader of 'The Moral Majority' in the USA in the 1980s, was the leading promoter of this version. *The basic NKJV New Testament text is actually the Farstad Hodges so-called 'Majority' Text. See *King James Version Ditches Blind Guides* by Dr Mrs Riplinger, p 50 and *When the KJV Departs from the 'Majority' Text* by Dr J. A. Moorman, B.F.T. #1617, Chapter 3.
6. Westcott and Hort were the two Cambridge academics who masterminded the Revision Committee which produced the Revised Version in 1881. The RV departs repeatedly from the AV1611 by means of Codices Aleph and B.
7. Rome tried to flood England with the Jesuit Rheims New Testament of 1582 but the English people rejected it. She then resorted to the Spanish Armada of 1588 in order to Catholicise the people of England against their will. The Armada also failed. *"God blew and they were scattered"* www.elizabethi.org/uk/armada/.

1.6 Codex B and Codex Aleph, the "Sin-Vat"[6 pp 60-61, 17 p 408]

The two most prominent Alexandrian manuscripts are Codex B Vaticanus and Codex ℵ, Aleph, Sinaiticus. A summary of their history and contents reveals their corrupt nature.

1.6.1 **Codex B Vaticanus**

1. It was found in excellent condition in the Vatican library in 1481 and never influenced the Protestant Reformation.
2. It omits Genesis 1:1-46:28, parts of 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Nehemiah, Psalm 105:26-137:6, Matthew 16:2, 3, John 7:53-8:12, the Pauline Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews 9:14-13:25, Revelation.
3. It leaves blank columns for Mark 16:9-20[18 p 67]. This is a most serious omission, although paradoxically, the blank columns provide additional testimony for the existence of this passage.
4. It includes the Apocrypha as part of the Old Testament Text. Protestant Bibles do NOT[5 p 98, 19].

1.6.2 **Codex ℵ, Aleph, Sinaiticus**

1. It was found in a trash pile in St. Catherine's Monastery near Mt. Sinai in 1844 by Count Tischendorf, who finally obtained the entire manuscript in 1859.
2. It omits Genesis 23:19-24:46, Numbers 5:27-7:20, 1 Chronicles 9:27-19:17, Exodus, Joshua, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, Judges, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:12.
3. It adds *Shepherd of Hermes* and *Epistle of Barnabus* to the New Testament Text. These books command readers to take the name of the world ruler, give up to this world ruler and form a one-world (papal) government. This 'world ruler' is the beast of Revelation 13, 17[12 pp 557ff].

Codices Aleph and B disagree with each other over 3000 times in the Gospels alone[6 p 60]. Nevertheless, they have been designated as *"The most reliable early manuscripts"* and *"The earliest and most reliable manuscripts"* by the 1978 NIV New Testament, pp 70, 127*. Note Burgon's verdict.

*The 1984 Edition reads *"The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witness"* and *"The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witness."* The milder tone of the updated annotations very likely reflects the influence of King James Bible believers on the NIV editors during the intervening decade.

"The impurity of the Texts exhibited by Codices B and Aleph is not a matter of opinion but a matter of fact. These are two of the least trustworthy documents in existence. So far from allowing Dr. Hort's position that 'A Text formed by taking Codex B as the sole authority would be incomparably nearer the truth than a Text similarly taken from any other Greek or single document' we venture to assert that it would be on the contrary, by far the foulest Text that had ever seen the light: worse, that is to say, even than the Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort. And that is saying a great deal" Dean Burgon[13 pp 315-316].

1.7 **Two Lines of Church History**[2 pp 176-318, 16, 20 p 6]

1.7.1 **The Bible-Believing Line**

1. The Bible of Antioch goes to the ends of the earth via the Waldenses and other Protestant or Bible-believing groups, including English Methodists and Anabaptists. See Section 1.8 for an overview of the pioneering work of the early missionaries that took the Bible of Antioch into Europe and the cost.
2. This Bible was translated into Indian and Chinese dialects long before 1890.

3. Every major language had access to the AV1611 Text before 1901.
4. All revivals, reformation, soul-winning and interest in Bible study follow this Text.
5. The acknowledged great men of God, Bunyan, Wesley, Carey, Moody, Finney, Spurgeon and others follow this Text, for all or most of their public ministries.
6. Material prosperity, political stability, humanitarian effort, progress in art, literature, music, science and technology and the emergence of a stable, productive, law abiding, morally upright, educated 'middle class' follow the dissemination of this Text.

1.7.2 The Bible-Rejecting Line

1. The 'bible' of Alexandria was used by Jerome to translate the so-called 'Vulgate.'
2. This text predominated in Europe throughout the Dark Ages.
3. This was or is the text of the popes, the Jesuits, the Inquisition, and by association Catholic dictators such as Charlemagne, Bloody Mary, Philip II, the Hapsburgs, Mussolini, Hitler and Catholic terrorist groups such as the IRA and those like them such as the ANC.
4. This is the text that produced Italy, Latin and South America, Spain, Portugal, South Ireland, the Philippines and - indirectly - Russia, both Czarist and Marxist. The history of these nations is one of widespread poverty, political instability, corruption and repression, terrorist movements, lack of true missionary zeal, lack of true Christian conduct and - until recently - absence of religious freedom[1 p 119].
5. No Scriptural work for God ever stems from this text but every major war since 400 AD DOES[16 pp 378-381].
6. This text was resurrected in 1881 by Westcott and Hort in place of the Reformation Textus Receptus as the 'Revised Version.' The latter part of the 19th century marks the beginning of Britain's decline as a world power.

1.8 The Work of the Missionaries

"In the silent watches of the night, along the lonely paths of Asia Minor where robbers and wild beasts lurked, might have been seen the noble missionaries carrying manuscripts, and verifying documents from the churches of Judea to encourage their struggling brethren under the iron heel of the Papacy."[2 p 214]

The Vaudois, or Waldenses of northern Italy took a solemn oath to maintain the purity of the scriptures, 1561[21 pp 88-91], for the sake of future generations.

"We promise to maintain the Bible, whole and without admixture, according to the usage of the true Apostolic Church, persevering in this holy religion, though it be at the peril of our life, in order that we may transmit it to our children, intact and pure, as we received it from our fathers."

These early and devoted believers maintained a faithful witness to the Gospel of Christ throughout Medieval times and laid a sure foundation for the Reformation which came about in the 16th century through the ministry of Martin Luther.

"There was no kingdom of Southern and Central Europe to which these missionaries did not find their way, and where they did not leave traces of their visit in the disciples whom they made...their track being marked with the edifices for worship and the stakes of martyrdom that arose around their steps."[21 p 16]

"The fog was rolling away from the plains and hills of Europe. The pure Bible which long had sustained the faith of the Vaudois, was soon to be adopted by others so mighty that they would shake Europe from the Alps to the North Sea. The light had begun spreading unobserved, and the Reformation was on the point of being anticipated. The demon Innocent III was the first to decry the streaks of day on the crest of the Alps. Horror-stricken, he started up, and began to thunder for his pandemonium against a faith which...was threatening to dissolve the power of Rome."[2 p 224]

The retaliation of Rome was characteristically savage. John Milton gave testimony to her brutality in his poem *On The Late Massacre at Piedmont, 1655*[21 p 150].

"Avenge, O Lord, Thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
"Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
"Even them who kept Thy truth so pure of old,
"When all our fathers worship stocks and stones..."

An eyewitness account of the massacre had this to say.

"My hand trembles so that I scarce can hold the pen, and my tears mingle in torrents with my ink, while I write the deeds of these children of darkness - blacker even than the Prince of Darkness himself" Jean Leger, Waldensian pastor 1655[21 p 144].

"Alexandria" replacing *"Antioch"…*

For more details, see *Fox's Book of Martyrs*, edited by Forbush.

2

The Restoration of the Received Text[2 pp 216-217, 225-246, 5 pp 193-208]

With the dawning of the Reformation, God used a number of distinguished scholars to produce editions of the New Testament in Greek, from the faithfully preserved manuscripts of Antioch. These Greek editions culminated in the publication of the AV1611 a century later.

Again it must be stressed, see Section 1.1, that the publication of the Received Greek Text served mainly an important additional witness, 2 Corinthians 13:1, to ***"the scripture of truth"*** Daniel 10:21 *already in circulation* as the faithful vernacular Bibles. See again *In Awe of Thy Word* Parts 6, 7.

2.1 Erasmus of Rotterdam

1. Refugees from the fall of Constantinople, 1453 AD, brought thousands of Greek manuscripts to Europe.
2. Desiderius Erasmus was the intellectual giant of Europe, an outstanding scholar who travelled widely in pursuit of his researches. Although a Catholic, he publicly denounced the Roman Catholic Church in many books. He classified Greek manuscripts and studied the church fathers extensively.
3. Between 1516 and 1535, Erasmus published 5 editions of the Greek New Testament Received Text. The 3rd, 1522, includes the Johannine Comma, 1 John 5:7. He mainly used 5 Antiochan manuscripts to compile his New Testaments but had access to many more. He rejected the Vulgate of Jerome and knew of almost all the important variant readings in the Greek New Testament manuscripts. Erasmus understood that his Received Text was that of the apostolic church, as later writers affirm.

"The pedigree (of the Received Text) stretches back to remote antiquity. The first ancestor of the Received Text was, as Dr. Hort is careful to remind us, at least contemporary with the oldest of our extant manuscripts, if not older than any of them."[2 p 227]

"I would have the weakest woman read the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul...I would have those words translated into all languages, so that not only Scots and Irishmen, but Turks and Saracens might read them. I long for the plowboy to sing them to himself as he follows the plow, the weaver to hum them to the tune of his shuttle, the traveller to beguile with them the dullness of his journey...Other studies we may regret having undertaken, but happy is the man upon whom death comes when he is engaged in these. These sacred words give you the very image of Christ speaking, healing, dying, rising again, and make Him so present that were He before your very eyes you would not more truly see Him" Erasmus[9 pp 37-38].

2.2 Robert Stephanus

1. Stephanus was a French printer and scholar.
2. He produced a Latin New Testament in 1523 and two editions of the Hebrew Old Testament. (The first nominally Christian publication in Europe of the Hebrew Old Testament appeared in 1522. It used the Rabbinic Text of Daniel Bomberg, published in 1516-17 and was mainly the work of Cardinal Ximenes[22 p p11-12].)

3. Stephanus produced 4 editions of the Greek New Testament Received Text. The Interlinear Greek English New Testament first published by George Ricker Berry in 1897 is the 3rd Edition of Stephanus, 1550.

   It should be stressed that although the 1550 Edition of Stephanus is an important witness to the text of the 1611 Holy Bible, it differs from the AV1611 in various readings and must never be used in authority over the 1611 Holy Bible. No Greek New Testament edition is ***"all scripture...given by inspiration of God"*** 2 Timothy 3:16 but simply a witness to it, good or bad depending on the level of agreement with the King James New Testament. See *Hazardous Materials* by Dr Mrs Riplinger Chapter 19 ***"Very Wary of George Ricker Berry."***

4. Stephanus was forced by Roman Catholics to leave Paris in 1550 because of his work on the New Testament. He settled in Geneva and became a Protestant.

5. With Beza, he was largely responsible for the verse divisions of the AV1611 and ALL subsequent versions, TBS *Quarterly Record* No. 462, Jan-Mar. 1978.

2.3 Theodore Beza

1. Beza was Calvin's disciple and successor at Geneva.

2. He produced 10 editions of the Greek New Testament Received Text.

3. The AV1611 Text is based largely on his 4th and 5th Editions, 1588-1589, 1598. Dr F. H. A. Scrivener took Beza's 1598 Edition as the one closest to the underlying Greek Text of the AV1611 New Testament. It should be noted, however, that Beza's Greek text was not a pure Greek text as such but made use of vernacular Bibles such as the Old Latin and the Peshitta Syriac. Beza's and other editions of the Greek Received Text are, as indicated earlier, important witnesses to **"the scripture of truth"** Daniel 10:21, the AV1611, but not perfect witnesses. See *Hazardous Materials* pp 642, 645, 680-685.

4. His editions upheld AV1611 readings for Matthew 6:13, Mark 16:9-20, Luke 2:14, John 7:53-8:11, 1 Timothy 3:16 and 1 John 5:7, which are omitted, altered or disputed by all modern versions.

5. Beza *"astonished the world...with the manuscripts he unearthed."*[2 p 210]

2.4 The Elzevir Brothers

1. They were Dutch printers of Leiden, in the Netherlands.

2. They produced two editions of Greek New Testament Received Text, in 1624 and 1633. A further 5 editions were published between 1633 and 1678[23 p 138].

3. The phrase *"Textus Receptus"* (or a close approximation) first appears in the preface to the 1633 edition. *"You have therefore the text now received by all (textum ab omnibus receptum) in which we give nothing changed or corrupt."*

Note that the Received Text had therefore made its appearance over 20 years BEFORE the Piedmont massacre of 1655. The damage was done but Rome is *"Semper Eadem,"* always the same. SHE DOES NOT FORGIVE OR FORGET.

3

The Men Behind The English Bible

"Go now ye that are men and serve the Lord; for that ye did desire" Exodus 10:11

As the Greek New Testaments were being published on the Continent, God was at work preparing the English Bible, before and during the Reformation. These were the Englishmen whom He used for this purpose.

3.1 John Wycliffe, 1324-1384

1. John Wycliffe has been called *"The Morning Star of the Reformation"*, Revelation 2:28, *"the father of the English Reformation"* and the founder of English Non-conformity[24 p 13].

2. He was also called *"The flower of Oxford"*. He was converted about the time of the Black Death, 1348[24 pp 9-10], to become *"the Evangelical Doctor."*

3. Of the Pope, he said *"Anti-Christ, the proud, worldly priest of Rome and the most cursed of clippers and purse-kervers (bag snatchers)."*[24 p 26]

4. He compiled the first complete Bible in English, 1382. Wycliffe's Bible was later revised, under duress, by Nicholas of Hereford and John Purvey, in order to match the Vulgate of Jerome more closely[16 pp 310-311]. Wycliffe's is the best known of the early, pre-16th century Reformation bibles. Almost all of the scriptures had been translated into English before the middle of the 14th century. Wycliffe's Bible served as a bridge for these early English translations to the 16th century English Protestant Reformation. See *In Awe of Thy Word* Chapter 21 *English Bibles Before Wycliffe*, Chapter 22 *Wycliffe's Views* and *In Awe of Thy Word* pp 777, 873 with respect to Purvey and Hereford.

   See www.avpublications.com/avnew/downloads/PDF/WycliffVSCloud.pdf *Wycliffe VS Cloud* with respect to Purvey and Hereford.

Of the Bible Wycliffe said:

"As the doctrines of our faith are in the Scriptures, believers should have the Scriptures in a language familiar to the people...It is impossible for any part of the Holy Scriptures to be wrong. In Holy Scripture is all the truth; one part of Scripture explains another."[24 pp 47-48]

5. In 1415, his body was exhumed and burnt and the ashes cast into the River Swift:

   "The little river conveyed Wycliffe's remains into the Avon, Avon into the Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they into the main ocean. And thus the ashes of Wycliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which is now dispensed all the world over."[24 p 75]

3.2 William Tyndale, 1495 (1484?)-1536

1. He was a student of Erasmus's Greek teaching, at Cambridge. He was probably converted there under the ministry of Latimer, Bilney and Cranmer.

2. He was *"so skilled in seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, French, that whatever he spoke you would suppose it his native tongue"*[2 pp 228-229] citing Herman Buschius.

3. He is said to have *"stamped his genius upon English thought and English language."*[2 p 228]

4. He produced two editions of the New Testament, in 1526 and 1534. This was the first English New Testament translated from the Greek Received Text[2 pp 228-229]. He was actively engaged in translating the Old Testament certainly up until the time of his arrest in 1534.

To *"the mitred Abbots of Winchcombe and Tewkesbury"* he said:

"I defy the pope and all his laws. If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth a plough shall know more of the Scriptures than thou doest."[2 p 229, 25 p 39]

5. He was betrayed, strangled and burnt at the stake at Vilvorde on October 6th 1536. His last words were: *"Lord, open the King of England's eyes."*

In 1538 King Henry VIII decreed that the Great Bible be set up in every parish church, in answer to Tyndale's prayer.

6. The AV1611 New Testament is 90% that of Tyndale.

"I perceived by experience how that it was impossible to establish the lay people in any truth, except the Scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother-tongue, that they might see the process, order, and meaning of the text" Tyndale's Preface to the Pentateuch[26 p 4].

3.3 Miles Coverdale, 1488-1569

1. He graduated as a Bachelor in Canon Law at Cambridge in 1531 and later received a Doctorate from Tubingen and Cambridge.

2. He was an Augustinian friar but when drawn to the Protestant faith, he had to flee to the Continent, where, with John Rogers, he became a disciple of Tyndale's.

3. He published the first complete printed English Bible in 1535, mainly from Luther's German[22 pp 15-16, 25 p 35] and dedicated it to King Henry VIII and Queen Anne Boleyn.

4. Coverdale's dedicatory epistle *"denounces the errors of "the blind bishop of Rome.""*

3.4 John Rogers, 1500-1555

1. He was educated at Cambridge and went to Antwerp in 1534 as a Catholic chaplain where he was converted by the scriptures and the witness of Tyndale[27 p 94].

2. He was responsible for the printing of the Matthew's Bible, in which Tyndale's work is reproduced as far as possible, supplemented where necessary by that of Miles Coverdale[27 pp 99-101, 28 p ix].

3. Coverdale's and Matthew's Bibles are the English foundation of the Great Bible 1539, the Geneva Bible 1560, the Bishop's Bible 1568 and the Authorized King James Bible of 1611, the AV1611.

4. John Rogers was burnt at the stake, February 4th, 1555, the first to suffer thus during the short and tyrannical reign of Mary Tudor.

3.5 God's Englishmen

The men who produced the early English Bibles had these things in common:

1. They were genuine scholars who approached the scriptures believing them to be the true words of God.
2. They had a God-given desire to impart the pure words of God to the ordinary people, NOT keep it locked up in the original languages.
3. They rejected the Roman Catholic Church and suffered as a result. It follows that Bible believers are anti-Catholic and Bible-reading countries are NOT Catholic countries.

4

The Company of 1611

"The Lord gave the word: great was the company of those that published it"
Psalm 68:11

To complete the work of Tyndale and the other pioneers of the 16th century, the Lord raised up ***"a band of men, whose hearts God had touched"*** 1 Samuel 10:26, ***"valiant for the truth upon the earth"*** Jeremiah 9:3. See *In Awe of Thy Word* Part 5, *King James And His Translators* and *The Hidden History Of The English Scriptures*, all by Gail Riplinger, A.V. Publications Corp., 2003, 2011, 2011 respectively.

4.1 King James 1, The British Solomon

The following statements are extracts from *Battle Cry* September/October 1985:

1. James was the first man to unite the feuding tribes of Scotland into one nation.
2. James united Scotland and England, laying the groundwork for the British Empire, birthplace of the greatest missionary movement of the modern age.
3. James founded of the Province of Ulster, by far the most Bible-believing, prosperous and Christian sector of Ireland.
4. James was the first earthly monarch on record to encourage the propagation of God's word in the language of the people[1 p 164].
5. James believed in salvation by grace and in the word of God, never wavering from his personal adherence to Protestant belief.
6. James broke the back of witchcraft in Scotland.
7. James was an accomplished scholar. He knew Latin, Greek and French perfectly, Italian and Spanish adequately and wrote poetry, theology and a tract against the use of tobacco!
8. He has been called *"The most hated character in English history for Greek and Hebrew scholars in the Protestant church, especially the modern fundamentalist branch."*[16 p 412] This distinction appears to have been bestowed by fundamental scholars for the reason given in point 4 above.
9. James gave Royal Assent to the Puritan proposal for a new Bible translation, 1604.

"To fulfil Acts 1:8...All the Lord needed was a Bible in line with what He had already written and preserved; since He had already decreed (in 1000 BC) that there had to be present "the word of a King" Ecclesiastes 8:4 before there could be any spiritual "power" in that word (Romans 13:1-4), and since His king was a JEW (John 18:34)...God needed a king with a Jewish name; He got one...this time it was JAMES. James is the English word for JACOB."[16 p 374]

4.2 Scholars of 1611[2 pp 13-24, 14 pp 183-195]

These were some of the 47 men chosen to produce the 1611 Bible.

1. **Dr John Reynolds**

He was the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, 1585. Reynolds was the leading Puritan who petitioned the king for a new translation of the Bible. Noted as a distinguished Greek and Hebrew scholar, *"his memory and reading were near to a miracle."*

2. **Dr Miles Smith**

He was Bishop of Gloucester, 1612 and writer of the Preface to the AV1611, *The Translators to the Readers*. *"He had Hebrew at his fingers' ends; and he was so conversant with Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic, that he made them as familiar to him as his native tongue."*

3. **Dr Laurence Chaderton**

He was Fellow of Christ's College and a noted Puritan. Distinguished as a Latin, Greek and Hebrew Scholar, he was still actively preaching at age 85. His sermons won about 40 of the clergy to Christ.

4. **Dr John Boys**

Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, to which he was admitted at age 14, he was able to read Hebrew at the age of 5. As a distinguished Greek scholar, he sometimes devoted himself to his studies of Greek in the university library from 4 a.m. to 8 p.m.

5. **Dr Lancelot Andrewes**

He was Bishop of Winchester and Chaplain to Queen Elizabeth 1. *"His knowledge in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac and Arabic...was so advanced that he may be ranked as one of the rarest linguists in Christendom...in his last illness he spent all his time in prayer - and when both voice and hands failed in their office, his countenance showed that he still prayed and praised God in his heart, until it pleased God to receive his blessed soul to Himself."*

6. **Dr Richard Kilbye**

Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, 1610 and an excellent Hebrew scholar, he was also expert in Greek. He once heard a young preacher give three reasons why a particular word in the AV1611 should have been translated differently. He explained to the young preacher how he and others had considered all three reasons *"and found thirteen more considerable reasons why it was translated as now printed."*

Many have followed, however, in that young preacher's train.

Not only were the translators of 1611 exceptional scholars *"but also Bible believers to whom the Scriptures were "God's sacred truth." With the bloody Reformation still afresh in their mind's eye, the translators of the Authorized Version were fully cognizant of the inestimable value of the word of God."*[9 p 41]

4.3 Materials used for the AV1611[9 p 42]

The following list shows that the translators of 1611 had more than sufficient material for their vital task.

1. All preceding printed English Bibles, including the Jesuit Rheims Version and all available foreign language Bibles.
2. The printed Greek texts of Erasmus, Stephanus and Beza.
3. The Complutensian Polyglot with the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Old Testament. The translators also had the Antwerp Polyglot of 1569-1572[22 p 12].
4. Several important uncial manuscripts and a great mass of cursive manuscripts
5. The Old Latin.
6. The Italic, Gallic and Celtic versions and the Syrian New Testament and the Gothic Bible of Bishop Ulfilas, according to *The Translators To The Readers* by Dr Miles Smith www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm.
7. Jerome's Vulgate.
8. Variant readings from Codices A and B[2 pp 250-254].
9. Many quotations from the early church 'Fathers,' according to *The Translators To The Readers*, including Eusebius, Augustine, Jerome, Cyril of Jerusalem, Justin Martyr, Basil, Theodotian, Theodorit, Tertullian, Origen etc. One of the King's men, Dr John Overall, *"was celebrated for the appropriateness of his quotations from the Fathers."*[25 p 89]

As Norman Ward states[9 p 42], *"The translators of 1611 had substantially the same selection of readings from which to choose as did the revisers of 1881, 1952, 1973 and 1979."*

4.4 The Original Title Page for the AV1611

A reprint* of the 1611 Authorized Version is available from the Oxford University Press. Inspection of the title page dispels some of the myths about the AV1611, which have often been propagated by apostate fundamentalists.

*For ease of reading, the text is in Roman, not Black Letter Gothic like the first printings of the 1611 Holy Bible, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authorized_King_James_Version.

1. The title is THE HOLY BIBLE.
2. The title is NOT 'The Authorized Version.' Its 'authorisation' came from its AUTHOR[29 pp 21-23].
3. The title is NOT 'The King James Version,' although this term is commonly used even by Bible believers. The term was first applied long after the publication of the AV1611, originally to avoid the word 'authority.'[29 pp 21-23]

   Nevertheless **"*Where the word of a king is, there is power: and who may say unto him, What doest thou?"*** Ecclesiastes 8:4.
4. The title does NOT include the Apocrypha as part of the scriptures.

5

The AV1611 - The Pure Word of God

"No book ever published has had a greater influence on civilization than has the AV1611. It is the pure, perfect, inerrant and infallible word of God."[9 p 40]

"We Anglo-Saxons have a better Bible than the French or the Germans or the Italians or the Spanish. Our English translation is even better than the original Hebrew and Greek. There is only one way to explain this: I have no theory to account for the so-called inspiration of the Bible, but I am confident that the Authorized Version was inspired" William Lyons Phelps, Lampson Professor of English Literature at Yale University, 1923.

"If accuracy, fidelity, and the strictest attention to the letter of the text, be supposed to constitute the qualities of an excellent version, this, of all versions, must, in general, be accounted the most excellent" Alexander Geddes, Roman Catholic priest, circa 1792[22 p 30].

"We are poor instruments to make God's holy Truth to be yet more and more known unto the people" The Epistle Dedicatory, AV1611, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm.

Why is the AV1611 the perfect word of God? The reasons are given below. The titles for the sections that follow have been taken from the references listed, in particular those of Dr Ruckman[29 Chapters 1-4, 30, 31, Chapters 8, 9] whose work supplies much of the material therein. See also Dr Hills for a detailed consideration of some of the Bible critics mentioned in Section 5.2 and others[5 Chapters 2, 3], wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/.

5.1 The Absence of The AV1611's Copyright[6 p 80, 29 pp 22-24, 30 pp 3, 4]

The AV1611 in all its editions carries no copyright. All modern versions are copyrighted by their respective publishing companies. *"By taking out a copyright on a so-called "Bible", the copyright owner ADMITS that this is not God's word but THEIR OWN WORDS"*[6 p 80].

"Copyright: Exclusive right given by law for term of years to author, designer, etc., or his assignee to print, publish, or sell, copies of his original work" The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 5th Edition, 1964.

Eyre & Spottiswoode editions, a 1970 Thomas Nelson edition and a 1988 Collins edition contain copyright notifications. It is interesting to see what happened with these publishers.

Eyre & Spottiswoode had been the King's (Queen's) Printer after Robert Barker, who published the 1611 AV1611 as the King's Printer.

It is therefore VERY interesting that the Queen's Printer is now Cambridge University Press, who inherited the right when they took over the firm of Eyre & Spottiswoode in 1990. Cambridge, of course, does not impose a modern copyright on the AV1611 and on the whole, the Cambridge Cameo and Concord AV1611 Editions are the best available AV1611s.

See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Authorized_King_James_Version.

"Seest thou a man diligent in his business? he shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men" Proverbs 22:29.

The New York Times reported in October 1997 that Thomas Nelson Publishers had agreed to return approximately $400,000 to shareholders in the fallout from a Securities and Exchange Commission case involving allegations of stock price manipulation. See www.nytimes.com/1997/10/03/business/chief-of-thomas-nelson-settles-sec-case.html.

The Wall Street Journal reported in November, 2011 that Thomas Nelson had been taken over by Rupert Murdoch, as also stated in *The Riplinger Report – Issue #13*, February 2012.

See online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203707504577010283227448426.html.

Collins was taken over by Rupert Murdoch in 1989 and is now Harper Collins. See en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HarperCollins.

Ironically, Harper Collins publishes *The Satanic Bible* by Anton La Vey, 1930-1997 i.e. 67 years, 6+7 = 13, under its imprint Avon. See www.harpercollins.com/books/Satanic-Bible-Anton-La-Vey/?isbn=9780380015399?AA=books_SearchBooks_17329.

Harper Collins also publishes the NIV under its division Zondervan.

See www.jesus-is-savior.com/False%20Religions/Wicca%20&%20Witchcraft/cos.htm.

See truthinheart.com/Zondervan.htm.

It appears that the Lord eventually loses patience with the 'correctors,' corrupters, 'clarifiers' and wannabe copyrightists of His Book such that He eventually does ***"deliver them into the hand of their enemies"*** 2 Kings 21:14, 2 Chronicles 25:20.

5.2 The Time of the AV1611's Publication

The AV1611 was published before the advent of French atheism*, German rationalism and English deism, *in the sense of the denial of the God of the Bible:

French atheists:

Rene Descartes, 1595-1650, who was Jesuit-trained, believed in himself as the final authority, Proverbs 26:12. In defiance of Exodus 3:14a ***"And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM,"*** Descartes deified his own mind with the statement *"I think, therefore I am."* This notion leads to hedonism, i.e. do as you please, as stated in Isaiah 22:13, concerning rebellious Israel ***"Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we shall die."***

Hedonism characterised much of 1960s radical student movements, the so-called 'swinging sixties' lifestyles and is still popular, still bringing forth its ***"evil fruit"*** as the Lord warned in Matthew 7:17, 18. Such corrupt fruit was also the work of the infidel Voltaire, 1694-1778, who like Descartes was Jesuit-trained. He attacked the Bible all his life and declared via a play written while in the Bastille prison that each man should be his own 'God.' Psalm 10:4 describes Descartes, Voltaire and others like them, for whom the Lord was at most a mere intellectual exercise.

"The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts"

German rationalists:

Johann Semler, 1725-1791, claimed that Jesus's teachings applied only to the time when they were first written. That claim also leads to hedonism, via the notion that the Bible is no longer 'relevant.' Semler also believed that the scriptures were not ***"given by inspiration of God"*** 2 Timothy 3:16 and therefore should be subjected to 'scientific'

criticism like any manmade writings*. Fellow German, Immanuel Kant, 1724-1804, believed the same. *Like the noted scholar Dr Benjamin Warfield[5 p 110]. See Chapter 6.

Scorning therefore that ***"The words of the wise are as goads"*** Ecclesiastes 12:11b, such as Luther's Bible and turning aside to false teachers like Semler and Kant, who did ***"prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart"*** Jeremiah 14:14b, Germany suffered two catastrophic world wars and a crippling depression in the 20th century. She has recovered only to suffer the future full wrath of God in the 21st century as one of the nations that attacks Israel just before the Lord's Return, Ezekiel 38. See especially verse 6 and ***"Gomer"*** i.e. Germany.

English deists:

Thomas Hobbes, 1588-1679, was a pantheistic* materialist who also believed that man was free to do as he pleased (i.e. more hedonism), within the limits of his physical prowess and that the law of self-preservation should reign supreme, ideas encapsulated in his book *Leviathan*, the title being an unwitting accolade to *Satan*, Job 41. *Hobbes believed in ***"gods many,"*** not ***"but one God, the Father, of whom are all things"*** 1 Corinthians 8:5, 6.

John Locke, 1632-1704, likewise championed human reason over God's revelation in scripture, insisting that the material world and the experience of the five senses were the basis for reality. He allowed for God only as a 'first cause' in the existence of the material world but Who remained as ***"THE UNKNOWN GOD"*** Acts 17:23.

The ungodly notions of Hobbes, Locke and others like them clearly reinforce the old lie of random evolution against God's special creation, which Hegel, 1770-1831, another German, therefore taught should be controlled by force, giving rise to Communism and Nazism. The ***"evil fruit"*** of ***"the understanding darkened"*** of these men, walking ***"in the vanity of their mind"*** Ephesians 4:17, 18 is described in Genesis 6:11, ***"The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence."*** See Luke 17:26.

Before these intellectual deceivers came to prominence, God in 1604-1611 could work through men whose minds had not been infected by modern philosophy and ***"the oppositions of science falsely so called"*** Colossians 2:8, 1 Timothy 6:20. Questionable texts and words in the Bible do not become questionable until AFTER 1611. The first 'textual critic' of the AV1611 in the modern sense is Richard Simon, a ROMAN CATHOLIC priest[1 p 91].

The translators also lived when the reign of Bloody Mary was still in living memory and therefore they did not honour the man-made traditions of Rome. Compare Matthew 1:25, 23:14, Acts 8:37, Colossians 1:14, James 5:16, 2 Peter 1:20 in the AV1611 with the equivalent readings in the New International Version, NIV or Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, JB, NJB.

Finally, the English language in the 16th and 17th centuries was perfectly suited to expressing the thoughts and concepts of Hebrew and Greek. English words were *"simple, broad and generic"*[8 p 22]. Examples are ***conversation***, ***bowel***, ***frame***, ***instant***, ***discover***, ***savour***, ***meat***, ***corn*** and ***church***. Note that ***"conversation"*** in Galatians 1:13 equates to ***"manner of life"*** in Acts 26:4, cross-referencing Paul's testimony but in Philippians 3:20 the word equates to ***"glory"*** in Philippians 3:19. 1 Peter 1:15, 17 show that the word can refer to ***"man's work"*** and 2 Peter 2:7, 8 show that ***"conversation"*** also means ***"deeds"*** and what is observed by means of ***"seeing and hearing."*** ***"Comparing spiritual things with spiritual"*** 1 Corinthians 2:13b will explain the other words in the above list and any more like them.

For comprehensive information on the AV1611's built-in dictionary, see *In Awe of Thy Word* by Dr Mrs G. A. Riplinger www.avpublications.com/.

However, the language of the AV1611 is not 16th or 17th century English style, which was very different. It is not a type of English that was ever spoken anywhere. It is Biblical English, which was not everyday speech in the 17th century, as even the AV1611 Preface shows. Even the singular *"thee," "thou"* etc. had been replaced by the plural *"you"* in ordinary conversation[5 p 218].

See also wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/chapter8.html.

5.3 The Honesty of the AV1611's Preservation

No translation from one language into another can be verbatim, or word-for-word. The AV1611 translators inserted words in Italics which had no direct equivalents in the Hebrew or Greek texts but which were necessary for clarity, good English style and grammatical sense. The translators also rendered the second part of 1 John 2:23 in Italics because it was absent from the Received Text, although attested by other ancient witnesses. See Gipp[10 p 52], samgipp.com/answerbook/?page=11.htm Question 11.

The practice of inserting Italics shows that the AV1611 is an honest translation, Romans 12:17. Most modern translations do not exhibit this degree of honesty. The exception is the NKJV, which was obviously forced to emulate the AV1611 in this respect. Note the importance of the word ***"is"*** in Italics in 2 Timothy 3:16. Although the NKJV follows the AV1611 here, the NIV does NOT.

As work on the AV1611 progressed, the translators kept the rest of the clergy informed and invited help from them[7 p 103]. This is another testimony to the honesty of the translators.

5.4 The Instruments of the AV1611's Preservation

See Chapter 4.

5.5 The Fruits of the AV1611's Preservation

See Section 1.7 and note that God has accomplished FAR MORE with the AV1611 than He ever did with the originals. This is only ONE reason why the AV1611 is SUPERIOR to the original manuscripts. For the 'fruits' of the modern translations, Dr Gipp[10 p 113] has this analysis. See also samgipp.com/answerbook/ *The Answer Book* Question 42.

"Today's modern translations haven't been able to spark a revival in a Christian school, let alone be expected to close a bar. In fact, since the arrival of our modern English translations, beginning with the ASV of 1901, America has seen:

1. *God and prayer kicked out of our public school.*
2. *Abortion on demand legalised.*
3. *Homosexuality accepted nationally as an "alternate life style."*
4. *In home pornography via TV and VCR.*
5. *Child kidnapping and pornography running rampant.*
6. *Dope has become an epidemic.*
7. *Satanism is on the rise.*

"If this is considered a "revival" then let's turn back to the King James to STOP it."

Much the same could be said of modern-day Britain.

5.6 The Pre-eminent Place the AV1611 Gives to the Lord Jesus Christ

The AV1611 is unique in this respect. ALL modern translations detract from the Person and Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ – and even from the Godhead. The NIV and NKJV omit the definite articles from 1 Kings 18:39, Isaiah 9:6, Matthew 27:4. The NIV omits ***"Lord," "Jesus," "Christ," "God"*** or similar terms 162 times in the New Testament[32] and slanders the Lord further in Daniel 3:25, Micah 5:2, Matthew 20:20, Luke 2:33, 23:42, John 1:3, 3:13, 16, 9:35, Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30, Romans 14:10, 1 Timothy 3:16, Hebrews 4:8 and 1 John 5:7. The NKJV (JFV) footnotes uphold many of the corruptions in the NIV text for these verses and retains in its text the NIV readings in Matthew 20:20, John 1:3, Acts 3:13, 26, 4:27, 30, 7:45, Hebrews 4:8.

Bible critics often insist that the AV1611 misses the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 with the reading ***"God and our Saviour Jesus Christ"*** instead of *"Our [great] God and Savior"* as in the modern versions, NIV, NKJV. Dr Mrs Riplinger[12 p 370] explains that not only is the AV1611 faithful to the underlying Greek expression but the AV1611 reading is a hendiadys, or the expression of a single subject by two nouns, connected with the conjunction *and*, i.e. the Lord Jesus Christ is both Almighty God *and* the Christian's Saviour.

However, the AV1611 reading in Titus 2:13 and 2 Peter 1:1 is actually a *superior* testimony to the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ than the NIV, NKJV variation. *"Our [great] God"* simply designates the Lord as God of the Christians. This variation allows for New Age flexibility, for other belief systems, e.g. Islam, Hinduism, Mariolatry etc., where other deities may be worshipped as 'God.'

By contrast, the AV1611 expression ***"God and our Saviour"*** shows that the Lord is GOD universally but *effectually* the Saviour of the Christian. Doctrinally, the Lord is, of course, ***"the Christ, the Saviour of the world"*** John 4:42.

See the work by Dr Mrs Riplinger[12 Chapter 27] for a full definitive analysis of attacks on the Deity of Christ in the modern versions and the work by C. Salliby, *If The Foundations Be Destroyed*, 1994.

These books can be obtained through B. McCall Barbour, 28 George IV Bridge, Edinburgh, EH1 1ES or online, www.kjv1611.org/, www.avpublications.com/.

5.7 The Pride and Inconsistency of the AV1611's Critics

Critics accuse the AV1611 as follows:

5.7.1 *The AV1611 contains many archaic words which need to be updated.*

Such words could easily be explained in the margin or in a glossary without altering the Text. Comprehensive but inexpensive glossaries are available[33]. Many supposedly archaic words are little changed from their modern equivalents and may be found in the *Concise Oxford Dictionary*. Moreover, alteration of a word in the AV1611 Text may destroy its full range of meaning. See Section 5.2.

Critics also overlook the fact that the AV1611 contains many 'modernisms.' Examples are ***addict*** (!), ***artillery***, ***God save the king***, ***powers that be***, ***head in the clouds***, ***housekeeping*** (!), ***communication***, ***every man for himself***, ***learn by experience***, ***labour of love***, ***many a time***, ***shambles***, ***advertise***, ***publish***, ***beer*** (!), ***the course of nature*** and many others. Much of the *"archaic words"* criticism is directed against the personal pronouns ***"thee"*** and ***"thou"*** etc. However, these supposedly archaic forms enable the

reader to distinguish between the second person singular ('thee') and the second person plural ('you'), a distinction lost in modern English. The retention of 'thee,' 'thou' etc. therefore makes the AV1611 Text CLEARER. Compare Luke 22:31, 32 in an AV1611 with an NIV or NKJV. The NIV has to insert a footnote to enlighten the reader.

Finally, one should be guided by the Bible itself in the treatment of 'archaic' words. See 1 Samuel 9:9, 11. The 'archaic' word ***"seer"*** is explained, verse 9 but retained in the Text, verse 11. See samgipp.com/answerbook/ Question 4.

A definitive work on supposedly archaic words in the AV1611 is *Archaic Words and the Authorized Version*, by Dr Laurence M. Vance, 1996, available from the Bible Baptist Bookstore, Pensacola, Florida, www.kjv1611.org/.

See the extensive work by Dr Mrs Riplinger on the AV1611's built-in dictionary in *The Language of the King James Bible* and *In Awe of Thy Word* Parts 1-5. See applications of the AV1611's built-in dictionary in *Twist and Curl – Your Fiendly* Neighbourhood Bible Correctors *Not a Misspelling* pp 58ff, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/why-the-av-only-7434.php.

5.7.2 *The AV1611 is hard to understand and therefore we need modern versions.*

If the AV1611 is *"hard to understand"* why did its Text cause the English people to become a Bible loving people, *"the people of the Book"* in the words of the historian Green? This commendation cannot be bestowed on ANY modern version. For example, the RAV, Revised Authorized Version, which was supposed to replace the AV1611, went bankrupt within a few years and now can only be obtained as its American counterpart, the NKJV.

Gail Riplinger[12 pp 195-214] cites the results of a survey carried out by the Flesch-Kincaid Research Company on the ease of reading of various Bible versions, including the NIV and NKJV. The AV1611 was found to be the easiest Bible to read in 23 of 26 comparisons. The AV1611 is also acknowledged to be the easiest to memorise. The NIV is particularly defective in this respect because it uses, on average, twice as many syllables as the AV1611 in any given passage.

Further, the belief that modern renderings are necessary for understanding denies the principles of interpretation stated by Joseph, Genesis 40:8, Solomon, Proverbs 2:1-5, Daniel, Daniel 2:18-27 and the Lord Himself, John 14:26, 16:13. Finally, the AV1611 was not hard to understand for those converted under its preaching, when it was, allegedly*, 120 years out of date:

"Two hundred miners standing in the field near the colliery at Bedworth, Warwickshire, listened with astonishment while a young Oxford graduate explained how they might have their sins forgiven. In the town of Bedworth colliers were rated heathen, animals, brutes who had no use in life other than to wrest coal from the earth. To be treated with respect and interest was a new experience. The unlicensed preacher could see "white gutters made by their tears, which plentifully fell down their black cheeks."

"It was a new experience for George Whitefield as well...."[34 p 291]

*Allege, or ***"alleging"*** Acts 17:3 is one of a small number of words that has changed its meaning since 1611 in everyday usage, though not in Biblical usage, Matthew 24:35. The present-day meaning is to make a strong claim. The Biblical meaning is to show or prove, as implied by the term ***"Opening"*** in Acts 17:3 and, using scripture with scripture, 1 Corinthians 2:13, by the expression ***"shewing by the scriptures"*** in the parallel passage Acts 18:28.

5.7.3 *The AV1611 is a translation and translations are made by imperfect men. Therefore the AV1611 must be imperfect.*

This criticism overlooks the fact that the originals were written by imperfect men. Moses murdered a man, Exodus 2:12, David committed adultery and murder, 2 Samuel 11:2, 15, 21, Solomon apostatised, 1 Kings 11:1-8, Daniel committed sacrilege, Daniel 2:46, Peter cursed, swore and denied the Lord, Matthew 26:74, Paul disobeyed the Lord and spent two years in prison, Acts 21:4, 11-13, 24:27, John tried to worship an angel, not once but twice, Revelation 19:10, 22:8, 9. Moreover, if a translation is held to be imperfect for that reason, what of the ORIGINALS for Genesis 42:23, Moses's conversations with Pharaoh, Exodus 4-14, Peter's speech from Joel, Acts 2:17-20, the reading from Isaiah 53 in Acts 8:32 and Paul's speech in Acts 22:2-21? The written originals of these passages were translations. Were THEY imperfect?

Critics should note that God has promised to PRESERVE the word which He gave by inspiration: *"**The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou shalt preserve them from this generation forever"*** Psalm 12:6, 7*.

*Some bible critics deny that Psalm 12:6, 7 is a promise for the preservation of the scriptures. Dr Ruckman refutes these criticisms in his booklet *Why Psalm 12:6, 7 Is A Promise Of The Infallible Preservation Of Scripture*, available from The Bible Baptist Bookstore, www.kjv1611.org/.

See samgipp.com/answerbook/ Questions 28, 29.

A variation on this criticism is that 'good, godly men corrected the AV1611 on occasion, so it must need correcting.' The simple answer is that when any man ***"holds the truth in unrighteousness"*** Romans 1:18, by exalting HIS own authority over that of the BIBLE, he CEASES to be 'good' and he ceases to be 'godly.' ***"My glory will I not give to another"*** Isaiah 42:8, not Torrey, not Spurgeon, not Ryle, not Calvin, not Wesley, not Moody, not Scofield, not ANY other.

5.7.4 *The original edition of the AV1611 contained the Apocrypha and the AV1611 still has pro-Catholic readings.*

The Apocrypha in the AV1611 was contained BETWEEN the Testaments. It was NOT part of the Old Testament and was not stated to be scripture in the title page of the AV1611. See Section 4.4. The Apocrypha was removed from one 1613 edition (see Section 5.7.6) and several subsequent editions published before the 19th century, when it became usual for publishers of the AV1611 to omit the Apocrypha. As for pro-Catholic readings, these are a feature of the modern versions. See Section 5.2. The alleged *"pro-Catholic"* readings in the AV1611 are insufficient for it to be sold by the Catholic Truth Society, although the CTS do sell the NIV!

5.7.5 *The AV1611 is obscure in some passages and inaccurate in others and therefore it should be improved.*

One should consider whether *"Nephilim"* Genesis 6:3, *"curds"* Isaiah 7:15, *"carved stones"* Numbers 33:52, *"demons"* Matthew 4:24, 7:22, 8:16 etc. and *"Hades"* Revelation 1:18, 6:8, 20:13 in the NIV are 'clearer' than the AV1611 renderings, ***"giants," "butter," "pictures," "devils"*** and ***"hell,"*** even if the NIV terms were more 'accurate', which they are not. Note that *"demons"* and *"Hades"* are transliterations, not translations, though these are readily available as familiar English words, and are

perpetuated throughout the NIV, NKJV, although neither the NIV nor the NKJV transliterated *"ouranos"* for ***"heaven"***!

One should also consider whether the pro-Catholic readings in the NIV and NKJV listed above, see Section 5.2, are more 'accurate' than the AV1611 even if 'clearer,' which they are not. Critics will change a 'clear' verse in the AV1611 to make it more 'accurate' and alter an 'accurate' verse to make it 'clearer.' Obviously the overriding aim is to alter the AV1611 Text at any cost. Note that where the AV1611 correctly translates ***"Jesus"*** in Acts 7:45 and Hebrews 4:8, the critics insert *"Joshua"* because they cannot understand that Joshua is an Old Testament type of the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, associated with the destruction of an accursed city, Joshua 7:26 and Revelation 18, 19:2[17 pp 337-338]. Moreover, Joshua 5:13-15 shows that the Lord Jesus Christ did command the people of Israel during their invasion of the Promised Land as ***"captain of the host of the Lord,"*** Who received worship from Joshua, just as He did from the disciples centuries later, Matthew 14:33. This Old Testament appearance of the Lord ***"whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting"*** Micah 5:2, was promised in Exodus 23:20-23, which refers to ***"mine Angel"*** of Whom God says ***"for my name is in him."*** The modern translations all overlook this essential feature of the conquest of Canaan and in so doing fail to give glory due to the Lord Jesus Christ.

5.7.6 *The AV1611 of today is not the same as the original AV1611 but has been changed in 20,000 places. Therefore we can legitimately introduce MORE changes.*

The changes in the AV1611 are mainly changes in spelling, punctuation, Italics, marginal references, capitalisations and rectification of printing errors. According to the American Bible Society, 1852, *"The English Bible as left by the translators has come down to us unaltered in respect to its text."*[9 p 43]

It is true that the original AV1611 has ***"he"*** in Ruth 3:15, while today's editions have ***"she."*** Each edition is correct because BOTH Ruth and Boaz ***"went into the city."*** See Ruth 3:16, 4:1.

Changes in the modern versions include elimination of words, phrases, verses and whole passages of scripture, resulting in the denial of the virgin birth, the blood atonement, salvation by faith alone and the Deity of Christ. See Chapters 6, 7. These changes are therefore of an entirely different NATURE from those in the AV1611 editions. The same comments apply to the notion that because the Alexandrian text is said to be 90% similar to the Antiochan Text[4 pp 89, 90, 211], there is therefore little difference between bibles from either text.

It should be noted that Vaticanus B, the most highly regarded manuscript of the Alexandrian text, is only 50% similar to the Received Text[12 p 551].

The AV1611 of today is Dr Blayney's Edition, published 1769[35 p 3]*. The AV1611 Text therefore has definitely not changed for over 200 years, which is more than can be said yet for the NIV and NKJV. *This reference indicates that a 1613 Edition of the AV1611 was published without the Apocrypha. The Trinitarian Bible Society lists editions from 1629, 1662, 1664 and 1682 without the Apocrypha.

5.7.7 *The AV1611 can be tolerated but surely any translation is satisfactory so long as it contains the fundamentals of the faith and we win souls.*

The 'fundamentals of the faith' can be written on the back of an envelope and found even in a JB, NJB or NWT, New World Translation of the Jehovah's Witnesses. This does not mean that they are Bibles. The AV1611 will always give greater emphasis on the 'fundamentals' than the modern versions. As Gail Riplinger shows[12] progressive modern versions for the 'New Age' will continue to undermine fundamental doctrine until it is no longer 'fundamental.' See also comments by Dr Gipp[14 pp 181-182].

See pp 285-288 of Dr Gipp's 2004 Edition, samgipp.com/historybook/.

A young preacher once said that he could preach from ANY Bible on *"justification by faith,"* even if we could only be sure of *"98%"* of God's words. Not only are there no scriptures to support this view but a 2% uncertainty in the scriptures yields approximately 600 doubtful verses. Any concordance will show that the word ***"justify"*** or its equivalent with respect to faith, occurs in no more than about 30 verses in the New Testament. Are THESE verses among the doubtful 600? Who decides and by what authority?

Concerning 'soul winning,' see Sections 1.7, 5.5 and George Whitfield's experience at Bedworth. Finally, if a bible is to be selected on the basis of preference, which is what the above criticism implies, perhaps one should ask what Bible does GOD prefer?

5.7.8 *The AV1611 may be tolerated but it is still inferior to "the Greek."*

To this criticism, it may reasonably be asked WHICH Greek, because there are about two dozen* different Greek texts[1 p 150, 4 p 176, 9 pp 3-4]. *Dr Mrs Riplinger in *Hazardous Materials* p 578 cites Philip Schaff as listing in his *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version* 666 (!) different Greek New Testament editions published between 1514 and 1883.

Today's most prominent Greek editions can roughly be divided into three groups:

1. The 'Received Text,' such as the editions of Erasmus, Stephanus etc.
2. The 'Alexandrian text,' such as those of Tregelles, Tischendorf, Griesbach, Hort and Nestle, who is the probably the best known editor.
3. The 'Majority text' of which there are two rival editions, by Farstad and Hodges, 1982 and Robinson and Pierpont, 1991[22 pp 73-74].

The 26th Edition of Nestle (1979) restored 467 Receptus readings which had been deleted in previous editions for the past 100 years[1 p vi, 29 pp 7-8]. Nestle's editors supposedly did this on the basis of evidence from the papyri, indicating that Receptus readings actually pre-date Alexandrian readings[1 p 329]. Moreover, while Nestle will use Codex B repeatedly to alter Receptus readings, he may abruptly switch to another manuscript if B agrees with the Receptus. ***"Him"*** is omitted from John 14:7 by Nestle's 21st Edition using B but all of Luke 24:12 is omitted using Codex D, although B agrees with the Receptus[4 Chapter 7, 29 pp 71-85]. Note that these omissions bear on the Deity of Christ and the resurrection of Christ. Ricker Berry's text retains the Receptus readings. See also Dr Ruckman's analysis[1 pp 328-331]. Similar inconsistencies exist in the selection of the texts for the NIV and other modern versions[12 pp 499-503].

This criticism really amounts to a denial of the promise of God to preserve His word, Psalm 12:6, 7. Similar comments apply where the critic insists that the AV1611 is inferior to 'the originals,' with the added observation that the originals no longer exist, have never been specified as a single, perfect, finally authoritative, inspired

Hebrew/Aramaic/Greek text between two covers and that the verses usually used to justify this criticism, 2 Timothy 3:15, 16, are NOT a reference to the originals! They refer to ***"the holy scriptures,"*** copies of Old Testament Books that Timothy had known ***"from a child."***

There are at least 8 reasons why the AV1611 is in fact superior to 'the Greek' - and to 'the Hebrew'[1 pp 332-343]:

1. The AV1611 uses ***"synagogues"*** in Psalm 74:8, instead of the Hebrew *"meeting places,"* showing that the reference is yet future, to the Great Tribulation, Matthew 24:21, Revelation 7:14.
2. The Pre-millennial order of the books from 2 Chronicles to Psalms in the AV1611 preserves the order of events in the history of Israel from the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD, to the Second Advent. This order is superior to that of the Hebrew Bible.
3. In an age ruled by the television, ***"pictures"*** in Numbers 33:52 is far superior to the original Hebrew of *"carved stones."*
4. The AV1611 alone uses ***"forces"*** in Daniel 11:38 instead of the literal Hebrew *"fortresses."* The AV1611 reading is superior because it is a reference to the use of electricity, Luke 10:18, the highest form of energy, especially in the tribulation. See Revelation 13:13.
5. The AV1611 has ***"churches"*** in Acts 19:37, showing where pagans devoted to ***"the queen of heaven"*** Jeremiah 7:18 (!), 44:17, 18, 19, 25 actually WORSHIP. This is far superior to the 'original Greek,' which gives *"temples."*
6. The AV1611 has ***"Easter"*** in Acts 12:4 instead of the literal Greek equivalent *"Passover."* Herod was an Edomite and would therefore observe Easter, not the Passover. See also Dr Gipp's comments[10 pp 3-8], samgipp.com/answerbook/ Question 2.
7. The tense of the Greek in Galatians 2:19 is *"I have been crucified"* but Luke 9:23 shows that a man is to take up the cross DAILY. The AV1611 reading ***"I am crucified"*** is therefore both correct and superior to 'the Greek.'
8. The AV1611 alone has ***"corrupt"*** in 2 Corinthians 2:17, where the 'original Greek' is "peddle," according to the modern revisers, *who thereby condemn themelves because they all support publishing houses that "peddle" or sell their versions*. There is no danger in selling the AV1611, because it isn't corrupt. However, there could be a great danger in the selling of CORRUPT 'bibles.' It would be rather like selling contaminated milk, 1 Peter 2:2!

For detailed discussions of the superiority of the AV1611 to 'the Hebrew' and 'the Greek,' with nearly 60 examples, see Dr Ruckman's analysis[1 Appendix 7] and reprints from the *Bible Believers' Bulletin*[36 pp 614, 622]. See also Dr Gipp's discussion of the distinction that should allegedly be drawn between the Greek words *"phileo"* and *"agape,"* which are both translated as ***"love"*** in the AV1611[10 pp 124-131], samgipp.com/answerbook/ Question 47. The English Bible's comment on this alleged distinction is found in John 21:17 and comparison of 'the Greek' with the English in Luke 11:43, John 5:20, 42, 16:27, 1 Corinthians 16:22, Titus 3:4, 15, Revelation 3:19 will yield valuable further insight.

Many critics of the AV1611 may still insist with Ricker Berry that, *"Without some knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, you cannot be an independent student, or reliable interpreter of the word of God."* The Lord's comment on this type of condescension is in Luke 10:21. Ricker Berry's statement can also be 'interpreted' as follows:

1. All translations are made by men who are imperfect and therefore their translations are imperfect (see above).
2. Any translation is therefore inferior to the original, which was perfect.
3. The original was in Greek (and so is the LXX which Christ and the Apostles (allegedly) used).
4. I KNOW GREEK AND YOU DON'T. THEREFORE YOU WILL HAVE TO COME TO ME (OR BUY MY BOOKS) TO FIND OUT WHAT GOD ACTUALLY SAID.

5.7.9 *The AV is out of date and modern man needs a modern version.*

"The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason" Proverbs 26:16.

5.7.10 *The AV is not inspired. Only 'the originals' were inspired*

See Section 5.7.8 above and the statement that 2 Timothy 3:15, 16, are NOT a reference to the originals. They refer to ***"the holy scriptures,"*** copies of Old Testament Books that Timothy had known ***"from a child."*** Timothy was from Lystra, not Jerusalem and he was of mixed parentage, i.e. ***"his father was a Greek"*** Acts 16:1, not one of ***"the chief priests"*** Matthew 26:3, who would have had custody over 'the originals,' even if they had existed then. It would therefore have been impossible for Timothy to have had access to them such ***"that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures"*** 2 Timothy 3:15a.

Yet Timothy clearly had access to ***"all scripture...given by inspiration of God***." The term ***"inspiration,"*** therefore, applies to copies of the scriptures and to translations, as the King's men rightly observed in *The Translators to the Readers*, www.jesus-is-lord.com/pref1611.htm, emphases added.

"We affirm and avow, that the very ***meanest translation*** *of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession...containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is* ***still*** *the* ***King's speech****."*

Critics of the AV1611 should note that:

1. NO Bible version has received anything like the criticisms which have been levelled at the AV1611, as this list shows.
2. Modern versions come and go, with well over 100* appearing in the last 100 years[22]. None lasts for more than a few decades. *The total from 1881 to 2010 is 253. See baptist-potluck.blogspot.co.uk/2010/08/bible-versions-since-1881.html.
3. God Himself has intervened at times to deprive some of the more prominent revisers of the power of speech[12 pp 446-452]. Those affected include Tregelles, an early editor of a Hort-Nestle type text, Westcott, Philip Schaff, editor of the ASV, from which came the NASV, as corrupt as the NIV, Kenneth Taylor of the 'Living' bible and J. B. Phillips, whose New Testament bears his name.

Psalm 12:3 should be a warning to all: ***"The Lord shall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that speaketh proud things."***

6

The Defection of the Church of England

6.1 Westcott and Hort[2 pp 262-318, 7 pp 23-34, 14 Chapters 7, 8]

The Devil was not slow to oppose the great blessings of revival, soul-winning and enterprise brought about by the God-honoured AV1611 Holy Bible. Through the agency of his own Papal Church, Satan concentrated his attack on the nation which had produced the Book*. His attack culminated in the efforts of Westcott and Hort, two Cambridge academics, to displace the AV1611 as the English Bible by means of their own Revised Version, RV, based mainly on the text of the Alexandrian manuscripts, which in turn formed the basis of Roman Catholic bibles such as the Latin Vulgate and the Jesuit Douay Rheims.

*See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *AV1611 vs Rome - The Holy Bible versus The Unholy Church!*

The attack developed as follows:

1. The Jesuit Counter-Reformation had begun even before the publication of the AV1611[2 pp 231-243].

2. Jesuits dominated the Council of Trent, 1546, convened to defeat the Reformation.

3. This council declared that belief in justification by faith alone was accursed, Canon IX, thus cursing the Lord Jesus Christ, John 3:16 and that the Apocrypha and church tradition were of equal authority with the Bible[2 p 4].

4. Jesuits tried unsuccessfully to impose their own English bible translation on the English people, the Jesuit Rheims New Testament 1582, based on the Alexandrian text. The NIV, in any of its editions, repeatedly departs in agreement with the 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament from the AV1611.

   See, www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *The Great Bible Robbery*, **Table 1**, *"O Biblios" – The Book*, **Tables 1**, **6**.

5. The Counter-Reformation nevertheless gathered momentum with the emergence of *"higher critics,"* particularly Germans, who attacked the Received Text and exalted the Alexandrian text. Among these critics were Schleiermacher, Griesbach (the pupil of Semler, see Chapter 5), Wellhausen, Lachmann, Tischendorf and Tregelles*. They were the new Gnostics.

   * Tregelles was English, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samuel_Prideaux_Tregelles.

6. German higher criticism invaded England in the early 19th century, resulting in the Puseyite movement to re-unite the Church of England with the Church of Rome. Cardinal Newman was one of the early defectors. See *Did The Catholic Church Give Us The Bible?* by David Daniels, Chick Publications, Chapter 8.

7. Romanising of the Church of England was well underway by 1870, when the Southern Convocation of the Church of England called for revision of the Text of the AV1611. The Northern Convocation refused to take part and there was no such demand from the ordinary members of the Church[7 pp 23-28].

8. The Revised New Testament was published in 1881.

9. The Cambridge academics, Westcott and Hort, were strongly influenced by Pusey, Newman and Coleridge, who imported the new German Gnosticism to England and by Richard Simon[14 p 131], *the Catholic priest*, see Section 5.2.

10. Westcott and Hort compiled the Greek text, based largely on Codices Aleph and B, which was *"secretly committed"* into the hands of the Revision Committee and used as the basis for the Revised Version[2 p 293].

11. This text differs radically from the Received New Testament Text, in 5337 places or in about 2 of every 3 verses.

12. The RV in turn differs from the AV1611 in over 36000 places. This is more than one change in every verse[2 pp 294, 298] although the first working rule of the committee was that as few alterations as possible were to the introduced to the Text of the AV1611[7 p 24].

13. Of the 25 members of the committee, only a small minority, led by Dr Scrivener, endeavoured to abide by the rules and they were consistently outvoted by the others[2 p 293].

14. The work of Westcott and Hort can be explained by their beliefs, expressed in their own words[2 pp 277-282, 12 pp 400-435, 14 pp 116-168]. Even if clandestinely, they were servants of Satan and of Rome.

15. Hort states:

    "The book which has most engaged me is Darwin...My feeling is strong that the theory is unanswerable."

    "Evangelicals seem to me perverted rather than untrue. There are, I fear, still more serious differences between us on the subject of authority, and especially the authority of the Bible."

    "Think of the vile Textus Receptus leaning entirely on late manuscripts; it is a blessing there are such early ones."

    "I have been persuaded for many years that Mary-worship and 'Jesus'-worship have very much in common in their causes and their results."

    "Moody had great sincerity...but in matter is quite conventional and commonplace."

    "Westcott...and I have started a society for the investigation of ghosts...being all disposed to believe that such things really exist...our own temporary name is 'the Ghostly Guild'."

16. Westcott states:

    "No one now (1890), I suppose, holds that the first three chapters of Genesis, for example, give a literal history."

    "Behind a screen was a 'Pieta' the size of life (a Virgin and dead Christ)...Had I been alone I could have knelt there for hours."

    "I never read an account of a miracle (of Christ), but I seem instinctively to feel its improbability."

    "Christianity rests upon the central fact that the Word became flesh. This fact establishes not only a brotherhood of men, but also a brotherhood of nations."

Concerning Westcott and Hort's approach to the Bible, Fuller states further that: *"In spite of his brave and oft quoted words to the effect that only a thousandth part of the New Testament Text is seriously in question, Hort himself did not feel that certainty was possible."*[3 p 279]

Would God choose such men to 'revise' His Book?? *Would YOU?? Do you suppose that GOD has as much sense as YOU??*

"Have I not written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge, that I might make thee know the certainty of the words of truth?" Proverbs 22:20, 21.

6.2 1881, The Year of Infamy

1881, the year of the publication of the Revised Version, was indeed a year of infamy for the Body of Christ. That same year, Professors Archibald Hodge and Benjamin Warfield of Princeton Theological Seminary attacked the Holy Bible by appealing to the lost 'originals.' In *The Presbyterian Review* in 1881[37] , they said this.

"All the affirmations of Scripture…are without any error, when the ipsissima verba [the precise words] *of the original autographs are ascertained and interpreted in their natural and intended sense."*

See again www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *AV1611 vs Rome – The Holy Bible vs The Unholy Church!*

That is, only the 'originals,' which you don't have, are God's words and only the 'scholars' can tell you what God *really* said. So 'scholarship' is now the final authority for Protestants, just as the Church is the final authority for Catholics. Today, Christian fundamentalists proclaim the heresy of 'scholarship-onlyism' or 'originals-onlyism' from pulpits up and down the land. Why no revival? You have the answer.

6.3 John Burgon, Dean of Chicester[2 pp 86-105, 5 p 139]

In every age God has had men who like David have ***"served his own generation by the will of God"*** Acts 13:36. Such a man was John Burgon. His scholarly refutation of Westcott and Hort's revisions to the Holy Bible, entitled *The Revision Revised*[13] stands unchallenged to this day.

1. Burgon was Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, Gresham Professor of Divinity and Dean of Chichester 1876-1888.
2. He was described as *"a deep and laborious student...examining the original (i.e. extant) manuscripts on every occasion, and he himself discovered many manuscripts in his search for the truth in textual matters...As for his learning, even his adversaries acknowledged that it was very great."*[2 pp 86-87]
3. He personally scrutinised Codices Aleph and B, concluding *"we suspect that these two manuscripts are indebted for their preservation; SOLELY TO THEIR ASCERTAINED EVIL CHARACTER."*[2 pp 93-94]
4. Whereas Hort declared of the New Testament *"we dare not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient texts,"* Burgon *"believed that the New Testament had been divinely inspired and providentially preserved...two basic verities which make the textual criticism of the New Testament different from the textual criticism of any other book."*[2 pp 102-103]
5. Burgon readily acknowledged the hand of Satan in the corruption of New Testament manuscripts: *"Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next*

directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel."[5 pp 140-141, 13 p 334]

6. He was a staunch defender, not only of the Received Text but of the AV1611. Of the 1881 Revision he said *"We are thoroughly convinced that the project of a rival Translation is not to be entertained for a moment. For ourselves we deprecate it entirely."*[2 p 105]

7. Burgon carefully set out 7 tests of truth for manuscripts readings[2 p 92]:

    1. Antiquity of witnesses
    2. Number of witnesses
    3. Variety of evidence
    4. Respectability of witnesses
    5. Continuity of witnesses
    6. Context
    7. Internal considerations

He declared that *"In the balances of these seven Tests of Truth the speculations of the Westcott and Hort school, which have bewitched millions are 'Tekel', weighed in the balances and found wanting."*[2 p 92]

Of Westcott and Hort's subjective exaltation of Codices Aleph, B, Burgon stated *"In contrast with this sojourn in cloudland, we are essentially of the earth though not earthy. We are nothing if we are not grounded in facts: Our appeal is to facts, our test lies in facts."*[2 p 91]

8. Hort had rejected the text of the majority of manuscripts by assuming that it represented a standardised text compiled by Lucian of Antioch in the 4th century[9 pp 32-35]. This was his so-called *"conflation"* or *"recension"* theory in support of which he could cite only a mere 8 verses. Hort's theory is refuted utterly by Burgon[13 pp 262, 271-294], who states that *"Their [recension] theory has at last forced them to make an appeal to Scripture and to produce some actual specimens of their meaning. After ransacking the Gospels for 30 years, they have at last fastened upon EIGHT."* Burgon concludes that *"not a shadow of proof is forthcoming that any such recension as Dr. Hort imagines ever took place at all."*[13 p 273]

9. Burgon vigorously defended scriptures rejected by Westcott and Hort using Aleph and B, for example:

Mark 16:9-20

Although retained by the RV, this passage was deleted from Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament and is disputed by the NIV and other modern translations. The 1978 NIV has a note between Mark 16:8, 9 stating that the most reliable early manuscripts do not contain Mark 16:9-20. The 1984 NIV notes only that *"The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have Mark 16:9–20."* The 2011 NIV notes that *"The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have verses 9-20."*

See Chapter 7 of the main work www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *"O Biblios" – The Book.*

Burgon showed that:

"With the exception of the two uncial manuscripts which have just been named (Aleph and B), there is not one codex in existence, uncial or cursive (and we are acquainted with, at least, eighteen other uncials, and above six hundred cursive copies of this Gospel), which leaves out the last twelve verses of Mark."[18 p 60]

Burgon also cited overwhelming testimony from the ancient versions, lectionaries and church fathers in favour of these verses[2 pp 168-169].

John 7:53-8:11

This passage is also omitted from the Westcott-Hort Greek text and disputed by the NIV and other modern versions. The 1978 NIV notes in its text that the earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have John 7:53-8:11. The 1984 NIV notes in its text that *"The earliest manuscripts and many other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53—8:11."* The 2011 NIV notes in its text that *"The earliest manuscripts and many other ancient witnesses do not have John 7:53-8:11. A few manuscripts include these verses, wholly or in part, after John 7:36, John 21:25, Luke 21:38 or Luke 24:53."*

See Chapter 7 of the main work www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *"O Biblios" – The Book.*

Burgon showed that:

"An omission which owed its beginning to a moral scruple was eventually extended for a liturgical consideration and resulted in severing twelve verses of St. John's Gospel - chapter 7:53-8:11 - from their lawful context"[18 pp 148-149]. However, he states that *"Jerome, who was familiar with Greek manuscripts (and who handled none of later date than B and Aleph), expressly related that (the passage) "is found in many copies both Greek and Latin.""*[18 p 146]

Again, Burgon cited other evidence overwhelmingly in favour of the passage, including 61 of the 73 copies of John's Gospel in the British Museum which contain the passage.

1 Timothy 3:16

The AV1611 reading ***"God was manifest in the flesh"*** is changed in the RV and most modern versions, including the NIV, to *"He who was manifested in the flesh"* or similar.

Burgon showed that ΘΕΟΣ *"Theos"* or *"God"* was invariably written ΘΣ, *"THS"* in the uncial manuscripts and could easily become ΟΣ, *"OS"* or *"who"*[13 pp 425-426] as it appears in Aleph and C or *"O," "which,"* in D. These are the only unequivocal uncial witnesses against *"THS."*[13 pp 426-443]

Writing to Bishop Ellicott, chairman of the RV committee, Burgon states that *"The sum of the available cursive copies of S. Paul's Epistles is exactly 254...Permit me to submit to your consideration as a set off against those two copies of S. Paul's Epistles which read ος, "os" - the following TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTY TWO COPIES which read Θεος "Theos"."*[13 p 492] Again, Burgon provides further evidence from early citations overwhelmingly in favour of the AV1611 reading.

He warns Bishop Ellicott[13 p 430]:

"It will be for you, afterwards, to come forward and prove that, on the contrary, "Theos" is a 'plain and clear error:'...You are further reminded, my lord Bishop, that unless you do this, you will be considered by the whole Church to have dealt unfaithfully with the Word of God."[13 p 430]

To this day, Burgon's case has never been answered. Ever ***"valiant for the truth"*** Jeremiah 9:3, he sought to safeguard the Body of Christ from the peril about which the Earl of Shaftesbury gave solemn warning in 1856.

"When you are confused or perplexed by a variety of versions, you would be obliged to go to some learned pundit in whom you reposed confidence, and ask him which version he recommended; and when you had taken his version, you must be bound by his opinion. I hold this to be the greatest danger that now threatens us. It is a danger pressed upon us from Germany, and pressed upon us by the neological spirit of the age. I hold it to be far more dangerous than Tractarianism, or Popery, both of which I abhor from the bottom of my heart. This evil is tenfold more dangerous, tenfold more subtle than either of these, because you would be ten times more incapable of dealing with the gigantic mischief that would stand before you."[2] pp 274-275

7

Flood of Revision

"When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him" Isaiah 59:19

7.1 New Testament Comparison, AV1611 versus Modern Counterfeits

The AV1611 will be compared in the New Testament with seven modern versions for sample verses that embody important Christian doctrine and/or practice, together with a near-equivalent of the Westcott-Hort text used to corrupt, 2 Corinthians 2:17, the AV1611 New Testament. Summary comments and conclusions follow this comparison.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *"O Biblios" – The Book*, Sections 7.3, 7.4 and **Appendix**, **Table A2** for details.

See rockhay.tripod.com/worship/translat.htm, www.studylight.org/ for online bibles including the RV, NIV, NKJV.

The seven modern versions and Westcott-Hort equivalent Greek text are:

1. The New International Version, NIV, the 'premier' evangelical translation.

   The 1978 NIV was used for the original set of readings in this section. Any changes between the 1978, 1984 and 2011 NIVs will be noted from biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/.

   No note means no change, or at least no significant change.

2. The New King James Version, the NKJV, (Jerry Falwell Version, JFV), the leading 'fundamentalist' bible, either with respect to its text or its footnotes.

3. The Douay Rheims Bible, DR, revised by Bishop Richard Challoner AD 1749-1752 www.biblestudytools.com/rhe/.

4. The Revised Version, RV, 1881.

5. The Catholic Jerusalem Bible, JB www.unz.org/Pub/Bible-1966, a modern equivalent to the 1582 Jesuit Rheims New Testament*.

   *See www.hailandfire.com/1582RheimsTestament/index.shtml.

6. The New Jerusalem Bible, NJB www.catholic.org/bible/.

7. The New World Translation, NWT www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm, bible of the Jehovah's Witnesses Watchtower cult.

8. Nestle's Interlinear Greek-English New Testament, 21st Edition, usually referred to as *"the Greek"* by modern fundamentalists and similar to the Westcott-Hort Text.

The sample verses follow.

Matthew 1:25

"firstborn" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., NWT, JB, NJB to uphold Catholic teaching of Mary as a perpetual virgin.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Matthew 1:25 "her FIRSTBORN Son" – Luke 1:28 "Blessed art thou among women" – Is your bible a Catholic Bible?*

Matthew 5:22

"without a cause" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The omission makes a sinner out of the Lord Jesus Christ, Mark 3:5.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Matthew 5:22 "without a cause" Did Jesus Sin When He Got Angry?*

Matthew 5:44

"bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, despitefully use you" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. DR omits ***"bless them that curse you."***

Matthew 6:13

"For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Matthew 6:13 & Luke 11:2-4 The Lord's Prayer – Is your bible a "Catholic" bible?*

Matthew 17:21

"Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Matthew 18:11

"For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Matthew 20:7

"and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Matthew 20:16

"for many be called, but few chosen" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Matthew 20:22, 23

"and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with" and ***"and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with"*** is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Matthew 23:14

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayer: therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Is Matthew 23:14 Scripture or not?*

Matthew 27:35

"that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 1:2

"The prophets" is changed to *"Isaiah the Prophet"* in the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 6:11

"Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 9:29

"and fasting" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n. JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 9:44, **46**

"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 10:24

"for them that trust in riches" is omitted by the Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 13:14

"spoken of by Daniel the prophet" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 15:28

"And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Mark 16:9-20

See separate note in Chapter 6.

Luke 1:28

"blessed art thou among women" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 2:14

"on earth peace, good will toward men" is changed to *"on earth peace to men on whom his favour rests"* or similar wording by the RV, NIV, JB, NJB or to *"towards men of good will"* or similar wording by the DR, Ne, NKJV f.n. and NWT. The gender-neutral 2011 NIV changes ***"men"*** to *"those."*

Luke 2:22

"her purification" is changed to *"their purification"* or similar by the RV, Ne, 1978, 1984 NIV, JB, NJB, NWT. The 2011 NIV has an evasive neutral reading *"the purification rites required."*

Luke 2:33, 43

"Joseph and his mother" is changed to *"the child's father and mother"* and *"his parents"* respectively or similar by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 4:4

"but by every word of God" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 4:8

"and said unto him, Get thee behind me, Satan" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 4:18

"to heal the brokenhearted" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 8:45

"and they that were with him" and ***"and sayest thou, Who touched me"*** has been omitted by Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., NJB, NWT. RV has ***"and they that were with him"*** and JB has *"and his companions"* but both omit ***"and sayest thou, Who touched me."***

Luke 9:54, 55, 56

"even as Elias did," "and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of" and ***"For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them"*** are omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The DR omits ***"even as Elias did."***

Luke 11:2, 4

"Our," "which art in heaven," "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth" and ***"but deliver us from evil"*** are omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Matthew 6:13 & Luke 11:2-4 The Lord's Prayer – Is your bible a "Catholic" bible?*

Luke 11:54

"that they might accuse him" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 12:31

"seek ye the kingdom of God" has been changed to *"seek his kingdom"* or similar by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 17:36

"Two men shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Luke 17:36 Is it inspired Scripture or not?*

Luke 23:38

"in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Luke 23:42

"he said unto Jesus, Lord" is changed to *"He said "Jesus""* or similar by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. This is a testimony of salvation that the modern versions have corrupted.

John 1:14, 18, 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9

"only begotten" has been altered to *"One and Only"* or similar by the 1978, 1984, 2011 NIVs in all 5 verses. The 2011 NIV has *"one and only Son"* in John 1:14, 18, where the 1978 NIV brackets *"Son"* and the 1984 NIV omits *"Son."* The JB, NJB have *"the only Son"* in John 1:14, 18, *"his only Son," "God's only Son"* and *"his only Son"* in John 3:16, 18, 1 John 4:9 respectively. The NWT retains *"only begotten"* in all 5 verses. However, the NKJV f.n. and Ne support the Arian and NWT reading in John 1:18 that Jesus was a *"begotten God."*

John 3:13

"which is in heaven" is omitted by NIV, Ne, NKJV f.n., NWT. The JB is correct but the NJB omits *"which is in heaven."*

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *John 3:13 "...even the Son of man WHICH IS IN HEAVEN."*

John 3:15

"should not perish" is omitted by RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

John 5:3, 4

"waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., NWT. The JB(!) retains the words but designates the angel as an angel of the Lord, thus adding to the word of God. The NJB omits ***"waiting for the moving of the water"*** and retains the incorrect reading *"angel of the Lord."*

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *John 5:3-4 - the troubling of the water - Is it Scripture?*

John 6:69

"that Christ, the Son of the living God" has been altered to *"the Holy One of God"* or similar wording by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The DR omits ***"living."***

John 7:53-8:11

See separate note in Chapter 6.

John 9:35

"Son of God" is changed to *"Son of man"* by the NIV, Ne, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. This is another testimony of salvation that the modern versions have corrupted. See Luke 23:42.

John 10:14, 15

"and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me" is changed to *"my sheep know me - just as the Father knows me"* or similar by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT.

The objection to the modern rendering is that it equates the knowledge of the Lord by the believer to that which is enjoyed by the Father. The result is either to deify man or humanise God, either tendency being heresy.

Acts 2:30

"according to the flesh he would raise up Christ" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Acts 2:47

"Church" has been omitted or altered to "number" or similar by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT. The NKJV f.n. indicates that ***"to the church"*** is omitted from the Nestle-United Bible Societies Text.

Acts 3:13, 26

"Son" is changed to *"servant"* by the RV, NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT. The change subverts the Lord's Deity. The DR omits ***"Jesus"*** in Acts 3:26.

Acts 4:27, 30

"child" is changed to *"servant"* by the RV, NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT. The change subverts the Lord's Deity.

Acts 8:37

"And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. This is another testimony of salvation that the modern versions have corrupted. See Luke 23:42, John 9:35.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article:

brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Acts 8:37...Scripture or Not?*

Acts 9:5, 6

"the Lord" and ***"it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him"*** are omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. This is another testimony of salvation that the modern versions have corrupted. See Luke 23:42, John 9:35, Acts 8:37.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Acts 9:5-7 Is it inspired Scripture or not?...*

Acts 15:34

"Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still" has been omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Acts 16:31

"Christ" has been omitted by DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. This is another testimony of salvation that the modern versions have corrupted. See Luke 23:42, John 9:35, Acts 8:37, 9:5, 6.

Acts 17:26

"blood" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Acts 23:9

"let us not fight against God" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Romans 8:1

"who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The DR omits ***"but after the spirit."***

Romans 10:15

"of peace" has been omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Romans 13:9

"thou shalt not bear false witness" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Romans 14:10

"judgment seat of Christ" is changed to *"judgment seat of God"* or similar by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

1 Corinthians 5:4

"Christ" is omitted TWICE by the RV, Ne, NIV, JB, NWT. The DR omits ***"Christ"*** once. The 2012 NIV further omits ***"In the name of our Lord Jesus."***

1 Corinthians 10:28

"for the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

1 Corinthians 11:24

"Take, eat" and ***"broken"*** are omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The DR has *"shall be delivered."*

See also Will Kinney's detailed article:

brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *1 Corinthians 11:24 My Body which is Broken for You...*

1 Corinthians 11:29

"unworthily" has been omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

1 Corinthians 15:47

"the Lord" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

2 Corinthians 4:6

"Jesus" has been omitted by the NIV, Ne, JB, NJB, NWT.

Ephesians 3:9

"by Jesus Christ" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Ephesians 3:14

"of our Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Ephesians 5:9

"the Spirit" has been changed to *"(the) light"* (2 Corinthians 11:14!!) by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Colossians 1:2

"and the Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

Colossians 1:14

"through his blood" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

1 Timothy 3:16

"God" has been altered to *"He"* or *"Who"* by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT. The DR has *"which."* See separate note in Chapter 6.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *1 Timothy 3:16 "GOD was manifest in the flesh" or the Vatican Versions "He"?*.

1 Timothy 6:20

"science" is changed to *"knowledge"* by the DR, RV, NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT.

2 Timothy 2:15

"study" has been altered to *"give diligence"* or *"do your best"* or similar by the RV, NIV, NKJV, JB, NJB, NWT.

James 5:16

"faults" is changed to *"sins"* or similar by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV (*"trespasses"*), JB, NJB, NWT.

1 Peter 1:22

"through the Spirit" and ***"pure"*** are omitted by the DR (changes ***"pure"*** to *"sincere"*), RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n. (***"through the Spirit"*** only), JB, NJB, NWT.

1 John 4:3

"Christ is come in the flesh" is omitted by the DR, RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

1 John 5:7, 8

"in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth" is omitted by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *1 John 5:7 These three are one.*

Revelation 22:14

"do his commandments" is changed to *"wash their robes,"* or similar wording, by the DR (adding *"in the blood of the Lamb"*) RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Revelation 22:14 Blessed are they that DO his commandments.*

Revelation 22:19

"book of life" is changed to *"tree(s) of life"* by the RV, Ne, NIV, NKJV f.n., JB, NJB, NWT.

See also Will Kinney's detailed article brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm *Revelation 22:19 Book of Life or Tree of Life?*

Observations

This sample comparison of **88** New Testament verses plus Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:11, see Chapter 6, shows that the modern versions:

1. Weaken or cast doubt on the testimony of scripture to MAJOR DOCTRINES.
2. Agree, with only few exceptions, with bibles declared by fundamentalists to be corrupt, the JB, NJB, NWT and often the DR, AGAINST the AV1611.
3. Follow or support the corrupt Alexandrian text of Westcott and Hort.
4. Detract from the Person and Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.
5. Fail to improve on many important truths revealed by the AV1611 and indeed tend to obscure such truths.
6. Weaken or delete readings that deal with HELL, ROME and DEVILS.

Of the **90** verses listed separately from Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:11 that modern versions continue to disparage, the DR, RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT agree *against* the AV1611 in **30** verses, or **33%** i.e. **one in three** of the verses listed.

Of the **90** verses listed separately from Mark 16:9-20, John 7:53-8:11 that modern versions continue to disparage, the RV, NIV, JB, NJB, NWT agree *against* the AV1611 in **81** verses, or **90%** i.e. **nine out of ten** of the verses listed.

Details of the above evaluations will be forwarded on request.

More searching surveys such as those of Dr Mrs Riplinger[12] will abundantly confirm the above results.

7.2 Conclusions

1. The answer to the question ***"whence comest thou?"*** concerning the Bible reveals:

   Two lines of bibles

   Two lines of Greek manuscripts

   Two lines of church history

   Two lines of men.

2. Of each of these two lines, one is honouring TO God, one is not.
3. Of each of these two lines, one is honoured BY God, one is not.

"Choose you this day whom ye will serve;...as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord" Joshua 24:15.

7.3 Practical Suggestions

1. Be guided by conscience, Acts 24:16. No one should be forced to abide by any bible against the dictates of conscience.

2. Be aware of the facts in the selection of a bible. ***"The prudent man looketh well to his going"*** Proverbs 14:15.

3. Be honest. If NO bible is inerrant, then NO bible should be declared 'the word of God' for **"*God is light, and in him is no darkness at all"*** 1 John 1:5.

4. Be consistent. If A bible IS the pure word of God*, then it must be ENTIRELY the pure word of God. ***"But as God is true, our word toward you was not yea and nay"*** 2 Corinthians 1:18. *The pre-1611 bibles of Wycliffe, Tyndale and others were clearly bibles in need of refinement, according to Psalm 12:6, 7. Post-1611 bibles such as the DR, RV, NIV, NKJV etc. are contaminations of the pure, refined Text of the 1611 Authorized King James Holy Bible.

"Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear" 1 Peter 3:15. Don't correct the BOOK, it will correct YOU.

Note that some years ago, a university academic with 20 years' experience of teaching New Testament Greek levelled various criticisms at much of the foregoing in its original draft. The full version of this author's work *"O Biblios" – The Book* answers these criticisms in detail and shows that they are invalid.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/ *"O Biblios" – The Book.*

7.4 Response To A Bible Critic

In 1995, James White, of Alpha and Omega Ministries in Phoenix, Arizona, USA published a 286-page book entitled *The King James Only Controversy*, in which he repeatedly attacked the AV1611. This author has compiled an extensive review of James White's book, including summary information from the works of various Bible-believing writers who answered White's criticisms of the Holy Bible. This author's review is entitled *The Whitewash Conspiracy*.

See www.timefortruth.co.uk/why-av-only/james-white-dr-divietro-and-dawaite.php *KJO Review – Full Text.*

See overleaf for a summary of this author's review.

Table 1 then follows in this work, with explanatory comments at the end. This table reveals the convergence of bible texts with the AV1611 Text as the English Reformation progresses, followed by the deepening apostasy of the last days. This apostasy is marked by:

- the increasing *divergence* of the modern versions from the AV1611 and
- the confluence of Catholic, fundamentalist, evangelical and heretical versions, in preparation for the Devil's one-world kingdom of the antichrist, Revelation 13.

We are in ***"perilous times"*** 2 Timothy 3:1.

The 'Whitewash' Conspiracy – re: The King James Only Controversy by James White

Review Summary

James White attempts to show that believing the Authorised 1611 King James Bible to be the pure words of God and the final authority in all matters of faith and practice, is wrong, because:

- There is no 'conspiracy' behind the modern versions against the AV1611
- The Greek texts underlying the modern translations have not been corrupted
- Modern scholarship that compiled these texts is entirely trustworthy
- The AV1611 is the result of human effort and contains errors
- The modern translations often yield superior readings to the AV1611
- The modern translations do not attack the Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This review will show that White is wrong in all six of the above respects and that his book is an exercise in dissimulation from start to finish. Summary answers to White's essential postulates are as follows:

No Conspiracy?

John Burgon, Dean of Chichester and exhaustive researcher into the Text of the New Testament, pin-pointed the Satanic conspiracy against the holy scriptures[13 p 334]:

"Vanquished by THE WORD Incarnate, Satan next directed his subtle malice against the WORD written. Hence...the extraordinary fate which befell certain early transcripts of the Gospel…Corrupting influences…were actively at work throughout the first hundred and fifty years after the death of St John the Divine."

Uncorrupted Greek Texts?

Of the early Greek manuscripts that underlie the departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version, Burgon[3 p 270], who collated them, said this:

"The five Old Uncials' (Aleph A B C D) falsify the Lord's Prayer as given by St. Luke in no less than forty-five words. But so little do they agree among themselves, that they throw themselves into six different combinations in their departures from the Traditional Text…and their grand point of union is no less than an omission of an article. Such is their eccentric tendency, that in respect of thirty-two out of the whole forty-five words they bear in turn solitary evidence."

Modern Scholarship Trustworthy?

The departures of the modern versions from the Authorised Version were orchestrated mainly by Cambridge academics Westcott and Hort. Of their 'scholarship,' Burgon stated[13 p 397]:

"My contention is, - NOT that the Theory of Drs Westcott and Hort rests on an INSECURE foundation, but, that it rests on NO FOUNDATION AT ALL."

A Modern Scholar Speaks

Of White's remaining postulates, this is the verdict of Dr Frank Logsdon[38], principal scholar behind the NASV, New American Standard Version, match-mate to the NIV:

"I must under God renounce every attachment to the New American Standard…you can say the Authorized Version is absolutely correct. How correct? 100% correct!" Amen!

Table 1

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Gen. 1:20												
Gen. 1:28												
Gen. 2:13												
Gen. 3:5												
Gen. 6:8												
Gen. 20:10												
Gen. 49:6												
Gen. 50:20												
Deu. 16:21												
1 Sa. 10:24												
1 Sa. 14:27												
1 Sa. 14:29												
2 Sa. 8:18												
1 Ki. 10:28												
1 Chr. 5:26								NJB				
Job 3:8												
Job 26:13												
Job 41:25												
Psa. 39:5												
Psa. 39:11												
Psa. 44:19												
Psa. 55:18												
Pro. 1:32												
Pro. 21:27												
Pro. 23:33												
Is. 5:14												
Is. 7:14												
Is. 9:3												
Is. 13:22												
Is. 14:9												
Is. 14:15												
Is. 28:15												
Is. 28:18												
Is. 34:13												
Is. 35:7												
Is. 43:20												
Is. 57:9												

Table 1, Continued

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	N/JB	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Is. 65:11												
Jer. 9:11												
Jer. 10:22												
Jer. 14:6												
Jer. 49:33												
Jer. 51:34												
Jer. 51:37												
Eze. 29:3												
Dan. 3:25												f.n.
Dan. 9:25												
Dan. 9:26												
Hos. 13:9								JB				
Am. 4:4												
Mic. 1:8												
Mic. 5:2												
Zech. 13:6												
Mal. 1:3												
Mat. 1:18												
Mat. 1:25												f.n.
Mat. 2:11												
Mat. 5:22												f.n.
Mat. 5:44a												f.n.
Mat. 5:44b												f.n.
Mat. 6:7												
Mat. 6:13												f.n.
Mat. 8:29												
Mat. 9:18												
Mat. 11:23												f.n.
Mat. 12:40												
Mat. 14:33												
Mat. 15:8												f.n.
Mat. 16:3												f.n.
Mat. 16:20												
Mat. 17:20												f.n.
Mat. 17:21												f.n.
Mat. 18:11												f.n.
Mat. 19:16												f.n.

Table 1, Continued

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	N/JB	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Mat. 19:17a												f.n.
Mat. 19:17b												f.n.
Mat. 19:18												
Mat. 20:7												f.n.
Mat. 20:16												f.n.
Mat. 20:20												
Mat. 20:22												f.n.
Mat. 20:23												f.n.
Mat. 21:12												f.n.
Mat. 23:14												f.n.
Mat. 27:4												
Mat. 27:35												f.n.
Mat. 27:44												
Mark 1:1												
Mark 1:2												f.n.
Mark 5:6												f.n.
Mark 6:11												f.n.
Mark 6:20												
Mark 7:16												f.n.
Mark 9:18												
Mark 9:29												f.n.
Mark 9:44 Mark 9:46												f.n. f.n.
Mark 10:21												
Mark 10:24												f.n.
Mark 13:14												f.n.
Mark 14:68								JB				
Mark 15:28												f.n.
Mark 15:39												f.n.
Mark. 16:9-20												f.n.
Luke 1:28												f.n.
Luke 2:14												f.n.
Luke 2:22												
Luke 2:33												f.n.
Luke 2:43												f.n.
Luke 4:4												f.n.
Luke 4:8												f.n.

Table 1, Continued

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Luke 4:18												f.n.
Luke 6:48												f.n.
Luke 8:45												f.n.
Luke 9:35												f.n.
Luke 9:54												f.n.
Luke 9:55												f.n.
Luke 9:56												f.n.
Luke 11:2 Luke 11:4												f.n.
Luke 11:54												f.n.
Luke 12:31												f.n.
Luke 17:36												f.n.
Luke 18:12												
Luke 23:17												f.n.
Luke 23:38												f.n.
Luke 23:42												f.n.
Luke 24:42												f.n.
John 1:3												
John 1:14												
John 1:18												f.n.
John 3:13								NJB				f.n.
John 3:15												f.n.
John 3:16												
John 3:18												
John 5:3								NJB				f.n.
John 5:4												f.n.
John 6:47												f.n.
John 7:8												f.n.
John 7:53-8:11												f.n.
John 8:6												f.n.
John 9:35												f.n.
John 10:14												
John 10:15												
John 14:14								NJB				f.n.
Acts 2:30												f.n.
Acts 2:47												f.n.
Acts 3:13												

Table 1, Continued

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Acts 3:26												
Acts 4:25												f.n.
Acts 4:27												
Acts 4:30												
Acts 5:30												
Acts 7:45												
Acts 8:37												f.n.
Acts 9:5a												f.n.
Acts 9:5b												f.n.
Acts 9:6												f.n.
Acts 12:4												f.n.
Acts 15:34												f.n.
Acts 16:7												f.n.
Acts 17:26												f.n.
Acts 17:29												
Acts 19:2												
Acts 19:20												
Acts 22:9a												f.n.
Acts 22:9b												
Acts 22:16												
Acts 23:9												f.n.
Ro. 1:16												f.n.
Ro. 1:20												
Ro. 3:4												
Ro. 3:6												
Ro. 3:31												
Ro. 6:2												
Ro. 6:15												
Ro. 7:7												
Ro. 7:13												
Ro. 8:1a												f.n.
Ro. 8:1b												f.n.
Ro. 8:16												
Ro. 8:26												
Ro. 8:28												
Ro. 8:34												
Ro. 9:14												

Table 1, Continued

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Ro. 10:15												f.n.
Ro. 10:17												
Ro. 11:1												
Ro. 11:6												f.n.
Ro. 11:11												
Ro. 12:11												
Ro. 13:9a												
Ro. 13:9b												f.n.
Ro. 14:10												f.n.
Ro. 15:29												f.n.
1 Cor. 4:4												
1 Cor. 5:4a												
1 Cor. 5:4b												
1 Cor. 10:28a												
1 Cor. 10:28b												f.n.
1 Cor. 11:24												f.n.
1 Cor. 11:29												f.n.
1 Cor. 15:47												f.n.
2 Cor. 4:6												
Gal. 5:21												f.n.
Eph. 1:18												f.n.
Eph. 3:9												f.n.
Eph. 3:14												f.n.
Eph. 5:9												f.n.
Phil. 2:6												
Phil. 4:13												f.n.
Col. 1:2												f.n.
Col. 1:14												f.n.
Col. 2:9												
Col. 2:11												f.n.
Col. 2:18												f.n.
1 Ti. 1:17												f.n.
1 Ti. 3:16												f.n.
2 Ti. 2:15a												
2 Ti. 2:15b												
2 Ti. 2:19												f.n.

Table 1, Continued

Flood of Revision – Verse Comparison, Pre-1611, Post-1611 Bibles and the AV1611

Verse	WY	TY/C	BIS	GEN	AV	DR	RV	JB/N	NWT	NAS	NIV	NKJ
Titus 2:13												
Heb. 3:6												f.n.
Heb. 4:8												
Heb. 9:7												
Heb. 10:23												
James 3:2												
James 5:16												
1 Pet. 1:22												f.n.
1 Pet. 2:2												f.n.
1 Pet. 3:15												f.n.
2 Pet. 1:1												
2 Pet. 1:20												
1 John 4:3												f.n.
1 John 4:9												
1 John 5:7												f.n.
1 John 5:8												f.n.
Jude 1												f.n.
Jude 4												f.n.
Rev. 1:6								NJB				f.n.
Rev. 1:8a												f.n.
Rev. 1:8b												f.n.
Rev. 1:11a												f.n.
Rev. 1:11b												f.n.
Rev. 5:14												f.n.
Rev. 14:1												f.n.
Rev. 15:3												f.n.
Rev. 16:5												f.n.
Rev. 17:8												f.n.
Rev. 19:1												f.n.
Rev. 22:14												f.n.
Rev. 22:19												f.n.
Departures	96	38	16	15	0	95	187	**237/240**	233	238	244	**86/213**
% Depart.*	**38**	**15**	**6**	**6**	**0**	**38**	**74**	**94/95**	**92**	**94**	**97**	**34/85**
% Depart.[+]	**46**	**15**	**8**	**7**	**0**	**43**	**76**	**91/94**	**92**	**95**	**95**	**30/86**
% Depart.[#]	**43**	**32**	**16**	**16**	**0**	**38**	**57**	**89/92**	**86**	**97**	**95**	**84/89**

*252 passages in total, 262 verses, +132 passages in total, 149 verses, **Table 9**, *The 'Whitewash' Conspiracy* by this author, #37 passages in total, 35 verses, **Table 6**, ibid. The results of **Tables 6**, **9** essentially match those of **Table 1**.

Notes

1. **Table 1** lists 252 disputed passages of scripture, including those listed in Chapter 7, from 262 verses, where the modern alternatives are put forward as 'improvements' on the equivalent AV1611 readings.
2. These 252 passages have therefore been used as test passages for comparison with the AV1611 for pre-1611 and post-1611 bibles, from Medieval to modern times. They represent an estimated 10% of major 'disputed' passages[39 pp 68-69].
3. **Table 1** lists the results for comparison of these 252 passages with the AV1611 for 13 bibles. Individual readings may be checked via the sources listed below.
4. A clear cell in the table denotes agreement between the specified bible and the AV1611 for the sense of the reading, although the actual wording may differ.
5. A shaded cell in the table denotes departure of the specified bible from the AV1611. The shaded cells marked JB or NJB refer to JB or NJB readings that depart from the AV1611. The shaded cells marked f.n. refer to NKJV readings that match the AV1611 in the NKJV text but follow the NIV in the footnotes.
6. 5 pre-1611 bibles have been used; WY, Wycliffe, TY/C, Tyndale/Coverdale in the Old Testament, BIS, Bishops', GEN, Geneva. The texts of these bibles may be found here, www.studylight.org/. (Insert any search text and click on the verse displayed to show the NAVBAR. Use the NAVBAR to go to any bible chapter and uncheck Include Resources box for an uninterrupted text display.)
7. 8 post-1611 bibles have been used; DR, Douay-Rheims (Challoner's Revision, 1749-1752), RV, Revised Version, JB/N, Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles respectively, also for the results cells, NWT, New World Translation, NASV, New American Standard Version, NIV, 1984 New International Version, NKJ, New King James Version. www.studylight.org/ has been used for the DR, RV, NIV*, NASV, NKJV, www.watchtower.org/e/bible/index.htm for the NWT, a printed edition for the JB, www.catholic.org/bible/ for the NJB. *Checked against 2011 readings via biblewebapp.com/niv2011-changes/.
8. The table shows that divergence of the pre-1611 bibles from the AV1611 Text for the 252 test passages decreases markedly as successive translations appear. The corresponding increasing convergence of the pre-1611 bibles with the AV1611 parallels the advance of the English Reformation from its inception in the 14th century to its maturity in the 16th century, followed by its crowning achievement early in the 17th century - the AV1611 Holy Bible.

The table shows further that the post-1611 bibles not only diverge increasingly from the AV1611 Text, in agreement with Rome and Watchtower but the popular 'fundamentalist' translations, NIV, NASV, diverge from the AV1611 even beyond contemporary Papist and JW versions, changing well over 90% of the test passages. Even the supposedly 'conservative' NKJV follows this divergence, with over 80% departures from the AV1611 in total and over 30% without the footnotes, almost as much as the DR. The accelerating departure of the post-1611 bibles from the AV1611 corresponds to the deepening apostasy of the church in these last days. *All* modern bibles are germane to this apostasy.

References

[1] *The Christian's Handbook of Biblical Scholarship* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, P.O. Box 7135, Pensacola FL. 32504, 1988, www.kjv1611.org/

[2] *Which Bible?* 5th Edition David Otis Fuller D.D., Grand Rapids International Publications, P.O. Box 2607, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501, 1984, kjv.benabraham.com/html/our_authorized_bible_vindicate.html, kjv.benabraham.com/html/answers_to_objections_to_kjv_b.html

[3] *True or False?* 2nd Edition David Otis Fuller D.D., Grand Rapids International Publications, 1983

[4] *The Christian's Handbook of Manuscript Evidence* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Pensacola Bible Press, P.O. Box 86, Palatka, Florida 32077, 1976

[5] *The King James Version Defended* 3rd Edition Edward F. Hills Th.D., Christian Research Press, P.O. Box 2013, Des Moines, Iowa 50310, 1979, wilderness-cry.net/bible_study/books/kjv-defended/

[6] *Let's Weigh the Evidence* Barry Burton, Chick Publications, P.O. Box 662, Chino, CA 91710, 1983, www.chick.com/catalog/bibleversions.asp

[7] *God Only Wrote One Bible* Jasper James Ray, The Eye Opener Publishers, P.O. Box 7944, Eugene, Oregon USA 97401, 1980. See also *New Eye Opener* leaflet

[8] *Perfected or Perverted?* Norman Ward, Which Bible? Society Inc., 605 Deeming, S.E., P.O. Box 7096, Grand Rapids

[9] *Famine In The Land* Norman Ward, Which Bible? Society Inc.

[10] *The Answer Book* Samuel C. Gipp Th.D., Samuel C. Gipp, 1989, samgipp.com/answerbook/

[11] *Supplement to The Inheritance Paper No. 9* J. Coad, Totnes, Devon

[12] *New Age Bible Versions* Gail Riplinger, Bible and Literary Missionary Foundation, 1993, www.avpublications.com/avnew/home.html

[13] *The Revision Revised* Dean John William Burgon, Centennial Edition, 1883-1983, A.G. Hobbs Publications, P.O. Box 14218, Fort Worth TX76117, 1983

[14] *An Understandable History Of The Bible* Samuel C. Gipp Th.D., Samuel C. Gipp, 1987,Daystar Publishing 2004, samgipp.com/historybook/

[15] *The Inheritance Paper 9* J. Coad, Totnes, Devon

[16] *The History of the New Testament Church* Volume 1 Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1982

[17] *Problem Texts* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Pensacola Bible Institute Press, P.O. Box 7135, Pensacola, Florida 32504, 1980, now *The 'Errors' In The King James Bible*

[18] *Counterfeit or Genuine? Mark 16? John 8?* 2nd Edition David Otis Fuller D.D., Grand Rapids International Publications, 1984

[19] *Interlinear Hebrew/English Old Testament*, 3 Vols. Jay P.Green, The Eye Opener Publishers, 1983

[20] *The Monarch of the Books* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore 1980

[21] *The History of the Waldenses* J. A. Wylie LL.D., reprinted by Church History Research and Archives, 1985

[22] *A Brief History of English Bible Translations* Dr Laurence M. Vance, Vance Publications, 1993

[23] *The NIV Reconsidered* Earl Radmacher and Zane C. Hodges, Kerugma, Inc. 1990

[24] *John Wycliffe The Dawn of The Reformation* David Fountain, Mayflower Christian Books, 1984

[25] *Translators Revived* Alexander McClure, reprinted by Maranatha Bible Society

[26] *The Newe Testament by William Tyndale (1526)* John Wesley Sawyer, The Martyrs Bible Series Volume 1, 1989

[27] *Pioneers of the Reformation in England* Marcus Loane, Church Book Room Press, Ltd., 1964

[28] *The Newe Testament of Matthew's Bible 1537 AD* John Wesley Sawyer, The Martyrs Bible Series Volume 2, 1989

[29] *The Bible Babel* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, The Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1981

[30] *Why I Believe the King James Version is the Word of God* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1988

[31] *The Christian's Handbook of Science and Philosophy* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1985

[32] *Desecrating God's Word* William A. De Jonge, Bible Truth Society (tract). See also www.av1611.org/tracts.html#BibleVersions for further informative tracts on Bible versions

[33] *A Bible Word List and Daily Reading Scheme* The Trinitarian Bible Society, London

[34] *A Treasury of Evangelical Writings* David Otis Fuller D.D., Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501, 1980

[35] *Differences in the King James Version Editions* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1983

[36] *Twenty-Two Years of the Bible Believers' Bulletin*, Volume 1, *The AV Holy Bible* Dr Peter S. Ruckman, Bible Baptist Bookstore, 1999

[37] *The Presbyterian Review*, 1881, Vol. 2, No. 6, scdc.library.ptsem.edu/mets/mets.aspx?src=BR188126&div=1&img=14, p 237-8

[38] www.av1611.org/kjv/logsdon.html

[39] *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament* Everett W. Fowler, Maranatha Baptist Press, 1981